arXiv:1603.02057v1 [math.PR] 18 Feb 2016

BOOTSTRAP PERCOLATION ON GEOMETRIC INHOMOGENEOUS RANDOM GRAPHS

CHRISTOPH KOCH

Institute of Discrete Mathematics
Graz University of Technology, 8010 Graz, Austria

JOHANNES LENGLER

Institute of Theoretical Computer Science
ETH Zürich, 8092 Zürich, Switzerland

Abstract. Geometric inhomogeneous random graphs (GIRGs) are a model for scale-free networks with underlying geometry. We study bootstrap percolation on these graphs, which is a process modelling the spread of an infection of vertices starting within a (small) local region. We show that the process exhibits a phase transition in terms of the initial infection rate in this region. We determine the speed of the process in the supercritical case, up to lower order terms, and show that its evolution is fundamentally influenced by the underlying geometry. For vertices with given position and expected degree, we determine the infection time up to lower order terms. Finally, we show how this knowledge can be used to contain the infection locally by removing relatively few edges from the graph. This is the first time that the role of geometry on bootstrap percolation is analysed mathematically for geometric scale-free networks.

Keywords: *geometric inhomogeneous random graphs, scale-free network, bootstrap percolation, localized infection process, metastability threshold*
Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C80, 05C82, 60C05, 60K35, 91D25.

1. Introduction

One of the most challenging and intriguing questions about large real-world networks is how activity spreads through the network. "Activity" in this context can mean many things, including infections in a population network, opinions and rumours in social networks, viruses in computer networks, action potentials in neural networks, and many more. While all these networks seem very different, in the last two decades there was growing evidence that most of them share fundamental properties [4, 24]. The most famous property is that the networks are *scale-free*, i.e. the degrees follow a power-law distribution $\Pr[\deg(v) \geq d] \approx d^{1-\beta}$, typically

E-mail addresses: ckoch@math.tugraz.at, johannes.lengler@inf.ethz.ch.
Date: March 8, 2016.
Most of the research was conducted during the first author's stay at ETH Zürich. The first author is supported by Austrian Science Fund (FWF): P26826 and W1230.

for some $2 < \beta < 3$. Other properties include a large connected component which is a small world (poly-logarithmic diameter) and an ultra-small world (constant or poly-loglog average distance), that the networks have small separators and a large clustering coefficient. We refer the reader to [15] for more detailed discussions.

Classical models for random graphs fail to have these common properties. For example, Erdős-Rényi graphs or Watts-Strogatz graphs do not have power-law degrees, while Chung-Lu graphs and preferential attachment (PA) graphs fail to have large clustering coefficients or small separators. The latter properties typically arise in real-world network from an underlying geometry, either spatial or more abstract, e.g., two nodes in a social networks might be considered "close" if they share similar professions or hobbies. It is well-known that in real-world networks the spread of activity (of the flu, of viral marketing, ...) is crucially governed by the underlying spatial or abstract geometry [41]. For this reason, the explanatory power of classical models is limited in this context.

In recent years models have been developed which overcome the previously mentioned limitations, most notably *hyperbolic random graphs* (HypRGs) [13, 12, 10, 44] and their generalization *geometric inhomogeneous random graphs* (GIRGs) [15], and *spatial preferential attachment* (SPA) models [2, 22, 35]. Apart from the power-law exponent β, these models come with a second parameter $\alpha > 1$, which models how strongly the edges are predicted by their distance. Due to their novelty, there are only very few theoretical results on how the geometry impacts the spreading of activity through these networks.

In this paper we make a first step by analysing a specific process, *bootstrap percolation* [20], on the recent and very general GIRG model. In this process, an initial set of *infected* or *active* vertices (the bootstrap) iteratively recruits all vertices which have at least k infected neighbours, where $k \geq 2$ is a parameter. It was originally developed to model various physical phenomena (see [1] for a short review), but has by now also become an established model for the spreading of activity in networks, for example for the spreading of beliefs [32, 25, 48, 45], behaviour [30, 31], or viral marketing [38] in social networks (see also [19]), of contagion in economic networks [6], of failures in physical networks of infrastructure [52] or compute architecture [39, 28], of action potentials in neuronal networks (e.g, [47, 49, 5, 21, 50, 43, 26, 27], see also [40] for a review), and of infections in life networks [25].

1.1. **Our contribution.** We investigate bootstrap percolation on GIRGs with an expected number of n vertices. We fix a ball B in the underlying geometric space, and we form the bootstrap by infecting each vertex in B independently with probability ρ. In this way, we model that an infection (a rumour, an opinion, ...) often starts in some local region, and from there spreads to larger parts of the network. In Theorem 1 we determine a threshold ρ_c such that in the *supercritical case* $\rho \gg \rho_c$ whp[1] a linear fraction of the graph is infected eventually, and in the *subcritical case* $\rho \ll \rho_c$ infection ceases immediately. In the *critical case* $\rho = \Theta(\rho_c)$ both options occur with non-vanishing probability: if there are enough (at least k) "local hubs" in the starting region, i.e. vertices of relatively large expected degree, then they become infected and facilitate the process. Without such local hubs the initial infection is not dense enough, and comes to a halt.

[1] with high probability, i.e. with probability tending to 1 as $n \to \infty$

For the supercritical case, we show that it only takes $O(\log\log n)$ rounds until a constant fraction of all vertices is active, and we determine the number of rounds until this happens up to a factor $1 \pm o(1)$ in Theorem 2. For the matching lower bound in this result, we need the technical condition $\alpha > \beta - 1$, i.e. edge-formation may not depend too weakly on the geometry. Notably, if the starting region B is sufficiently small then the number of rounds agrees (up to minor terms) with the average distance in the network. In particular, it does not depend on the infection rate ρ, as long as ρ is supercritical.

Finally we demonstrate that the way activity spreads is strongly governed by the geometry of the process, again under the assumption $\alpha > \beta - 1$. Starting from B, the activity is carried most quickly by local hubs. Once the local hubs in a region are infected, they pass on their infection *(i)* to other hubs that are even further away, and *(ii)* locally to nodes of increasingly lower degree, until a constant fraction of all vertices the region is infected. Indeed, given a vertex v (i.e. given its expected degree and its distance from B), and assuming that v is not too close to B, we can predict whp (Theorem 4) in which round it will turn active, again up to a factor $1 \pm o(1)$. In real applications such knowledge is invaluable: for example, assume that a policy-maker only knows initial time and place of the infection, i.e. she knows the region B and the current round i. In particular, she does not know ρ, she does not know the graph, and she has no detailed knowledge about who is infected. Then we show that she is able to identify a region B' in which the infection can be quarantined. In other words, by removing (from round i onwards) all edges crossing the boundary of B' whp the infection remains contained in B'. The number of edges to be deleted is relatively small: it can be much smaller than n (in fact, any function $f(n) = \omega(1)$ can be an upper bound, if i and $\mathrm{Vol}(B)$ are sufficiently small), and it is even much smaller than the number of edges *inside* of B', as was already noted in [15].

1.2. **Related work.** The GIRG model was introduced in [15], and we rely on many results from this paper. The average distance of a GIRG (which, as we show, agrees with the time until the bootstrap percolation process has infected a constant portion of all vertices) was determined in [16] in a much more general setup.

Bootstrap percolation has been intensively studied theoretically and experimentally on a multitude of networks, including trees [20, 9], lattices [3, 8], Erdős-Rényi graphs [36], various geometric graphs [49, 42, 14, 29], and scale-free networks [23, 11, 7, 38]. On geometric scale-free networks there are some experimental results [18], but little is known theoretically. Recently, Candellero and Fountoulakis [17] determined the threshold for bootstrap percolation on HypRGs (in the threshold case $\alpha = \infty$, cf. below), but they assumed that the bootstrap is uniformly sampled from all vertices, and not from a geometric region as in our paper. In particular, in this case the bootstrap needs to be polynomial in n to start an infection, while in our setting every ball which contains an expected number of $\omega(1)$ vertices can initiate a large infection whp. Also, due to their setup the authors did not investigate how activity spreads along the geometry of the ground space.

While there is plenty of experimental literature and also some mean-field heuristics on other activity spreading processes on geometric scale-free networks (e.g., [51, 53, 34, 54, 33, 46]), rigorous mathematical treatments are non-existent with the notable exception of [37], where rumour spreading is analysed in an SPA model with a push and a push&pull protocol.

2. Model and notation

2.1. **Graph model.** A GIRG is a graph $G = (V, E)$ where both the vertex set V and the edge set E are random. Each vertex v is represented by a pair (x_v, w_v) consisting of a *position* x_v (in some *ground space*) and a *weight* $w_v \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$.

2.1.1. *Ground space and positions.* We fix a (constant) dimension $d \geq 1$ and consider the d-dimensional torus $\mathbb{T}^d = \mathbb{R}^d/\mathbb{Z}^d$ as the ground space. We usually think of it as the d-dimensional cube $[0,1]^d$ where opposite boundaries are identified and measure distances by the ∞-norm on $\mathbb{T}^d$, i.e. for $x, y \in [0,1]^d$ we define

$$\|x - y\| := \max_{1 \leq i \leq d} \min\{|x_i - y_i|, 1 - |x_i - y_i|\}.$$

The set of vertices and their positions are given by a homogeneous Poisson point process on $\mathbb{T}^d$ with intensity $n \in \mathbb{N}$.[2] More formally, for any (Lebesgue-)measurable set $B \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$, let $V \cap B$ denote (with slight abuse of notation) the set of vertices with positions in B. Then $|V \cap B|$ is Poisson distributed with mean $n\mathrm{Vol}(B)$, i.e. for any integer $m \geq 0$ we have

$$\Pr\left[|V \cap B| = m\right] = \Pr[\mathrm{Po}\left(n\mathrm{Vol}(B)\right) = m] = \frac{(n\mathrm{Vol}(B))^m \exp(-n\mathrm{Vol}(B))}{m!},$$

and if B and B' are disjoint measurable subsets of $\mathbb{T}^d$ then $|V \cap B|$ and $|V \cap B'|$ are independent. Note in particular that the total number of vertices $|V|$ is Poisson distributed with mean n, i.e. it is also random. An important property of this process is the following: Given a vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$, if we condition on $x_v \in B$, where B is some measurable subset of $[0,1]^d$, then the position x_v is uniformly distributed in B.

2.1.2. *Weights.* For each vertex, we draw independently a weight from some distribution $\mathcal{D}$ on $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$. We say that the weights follow a *weak power-law* for some exponent $\beta \in (2,3)$ if a $\mathcal{D}$-distributed random variable D satisfies the following two conditions: There is a constant $w_{\min} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $\Pr\left[D \geq w_{\min}\right] = 1$, and for every constant $\gamma > 0$ there are constants $0 < c_1 \leq c_2$ such that

$$c_1 w^{1-\beta-\gamma} \leq \Pr\left[D \geq w\right] \leq c_2 w^{1-\beta+\gamma} \tag{1}$$

for all $w \geq w_{\min}$. If this condition is also satisfied for $\gamma = 0$, then we say that the weights follow a *strong power-law*.

2.1.3. *Edges.* Next we fix an $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>1} \cup \{\infty\}$. Then two distinct vertices $u = (x_u, w_u)$ and $v = (x_v, w_v)$ form an edge independently of all other pairs with probability $p(x_u, x_v, w_u, w_v)$, where the function p satisfies

$$p(x_u, x_v, w_u, w_v) = \Theta(1) \min\left\{\left(\frac{w_u w_v}{\|x_u - x_v\|^d n}\right)^\alpha, 1\right\}, \tag{2}$$

if $\alpha < \infty$. In the *threshold model* $\alpha = \infty$ we instead require that p satisfies

$$p(x_u, x_v, w_u, w_v) = \begin{cases} \Omega(1) & \text{if } \|x_u - x_v\| \leq C_1 \left(\frac{w_u w_v}{n}\right)^{1/d} \\ 0 & \text{if } \|x_u - x_v\| > C_2 \left(\frac{w_u w_v}{n}\right)^{1/d} \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

[2]Throughout the paper, all Landau notation will be used with respect to n. For example, the notation $x = O(1)$ means that there is $n_0 > 0$ and an absolute constant $C > 0$ that depends only the constant parameters of the GIRG model, such that $x \leq C$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

for some constants $0 < C_1 \leq C_2$. Note that for $C_1 \neq C_2$ the edge probability may be arbitrary in the interval $\left(C_1 \left(\frac{w_u w_v}{n}\right)^{1/d}, C_2 \left(\frac{w_u w_v}{n}\right)^{1/d}\right)$.

2.2. **Bootstrap percolation.** Let $k \geq 2$ be a constant, let $B_0 \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$ be measurable, and let $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$. Then the bootstrap percolation process with *threshold* k, *starting region* B_0, and *initial infection rate* ρ is the following process. For every integer $i \geq 0$ there is a set $V^{\leq i} \subseteq V$ of vertices which are *infected* (or *active*) at time i. The process starts with a random set $V^{\leq 0} \subseteq V$ which contains each vertex in $V \cap B_0$ independently with probability ρ, and which contains no other vertices. Then we define iteratively

$$V^{\leq i+1} := V^{\leq i} \cup \left\{v \in V \;\middle|\; v \text{ has at least } k \text{ neighbours in } V^{\leq i}\right\}$$

for all $i \geq 0$. Moreover, we set $V^{\leq \infty} := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} V^{\leq i}$.

We denote by $\nu := n\mathrm{Vol}(B_0)$ the expected number of vertices in B_0. Throughout the paper we will assume that B_0 is a ball, which is – without loss of generality due to symmetry of $\mathbb{T}^d$ – centred at 0. Moreover, we will assume that $\nu = \omega(1)$.

2.3. **Further notation.** We often consider subsets of the vertex sets which satisfy some restrictions on their weights, positions, or activity. We use the following notation throughout the paper: For a weight $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, a measurable set $B \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$, and a time $i \geq 0$ we set

$$V^{\leq i}_{\geq w} \cap B := \left\{u = (x_u, w_u) \in V \;\middle|\; w_u \geq w, x_u \in B, u \in V^{\leq i}\right\}.$$

All three types of restrictions are optional. Moreover, we use the superscript "$(= i)$" to describe vertices which are infected in round i, i.e. $V^{=i} := V^{\leq i} \setminus V^{\leq i-1}$ and $V^{=0} := V^{\leq 0}$ etc. Furthermore, the index "$\geq w$" may be replaced by "$< w$" or "$\in [w, w')$", with the obvious meaning. Additionally, we denote the neighbourhood of a vertex $v \in V$ by $N(v) := \{u \in V \mid \{u, v\} \in E\}$ and this notation may be modified by the same three types of restrictions, i.e.

$$N^{\leq i}_{\geq w}(v) \cap B := N(v) \cap V^{\leq i}_{\geq w} \cap B.$$

For any two sets of vertices U_1 and U_2, we denote the set of edges between them by $E(U_1, U_2) := \{e = \{u_1, u_2\} \mid u_1 \in U_1, u_2 \in U_2\}$. For a vertex $v \in V$, we define its *infection time* as $L_v := \inf\left\{i \geq 0 \;\middle|\; v \in V^{\leq i}\right\}$ and $L_v := \infty$ if the infimum does not exist.

For any $\lambda \geq 0$ and any closed ball $B \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$ of radius $r \geq 0$ centred at 0 we denote by λB the closed ball of radius λr around 0.

Since it occurs frequently in our proofs, we abbreviate $\zeta := 1/(\beta - 2) > 1$. For all $0 < \varepsilon < \zeta$ and all $i \geq 0$, we set

$$\nu_0 := \nu \qquad \text{and} \qquad \nu_i := \nu_i(\varepsilon) := \nu_0^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^i},$$
$$\widetilde{\nu}_0 := \widetilde{\nu}_0(\varepsilon) := \nu^{(\beta-1)/(\beta-2)+\varepsilon} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \widetilde{\nu}_i := \widetilde{\nu}_i(\varepsilon) := \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^i}$$

We define $B_i := B_i(\varepsilon)$ and $\widetilde{B}_i := \widetilde{B}_i(\varepsilon)$ to be the closed ball centred around 0 of volume $\min\{\nu_i(\varepsilon)/n, 1\}$ and $\min\{\widetilde{\nu}_i(\varepsilon)/n, 1\}$, respectively. Note that $B_i(\varepsilon) \subseteq \widetilde{B}_i(\varepsilon')$ for all $i \geq 0$ and all $0 < \varepsilon, \varepsilon' < \zeta$. The balls B_i and $\widetilde{B}_i$ will play a crucial role in describing how fast the infection spreads, cf. Theorem 17 and Theorem 19.

Given any constant $\eta > 0$, we define the functions $\hat{w}_-^{(\eta)}, \hat{w}_+^{(\eta)} : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$\hat{w}_-(\mu) := \hat{w}_-^{(\eta)}(\mu) := \mu^{1/(\beta-1+\eta)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \hat{w}_+(\mu) := \hat{w}_+^{(\eta)}(\mu) := \mu^{1/(\beta-1-\eta)}.$$

As we will see in Lemma 15, in a region with an expected number of $\mu = \omega(1)$ vertices, whp the largest weight that occurs in this region is in $[\hat{w}_-(\mu), \hat{w}_+(\mu)]$.

In general we will be interested in results for large values of n, and in particular we use the phrase *with high probability* (whp) to mean with probability tending to 1 as $n \to \infty$. Moreover, any unspecified limits and asymptotics will be with respect to $n \to \infty$. In the proofs, for the sake of readability, we will not state each time when we use inequalities that only hold for sufficiently large n. For example, we will use inequalities like $\nu > 2$ without further comment although they are only true for sufficiently large n.

Furthermore, all constants hidden by Landau-notation are positive. We often use statements that depend on parameters $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$. In this case, by the notation $O(\varepsilon), O(\eta)$ etc. we implicitly mean that the hidden constants only depend on the parameters $d, \alpha, \beta, w_{\min}, \mathcal{D}, \rho$, and k of the model, but not on ε or η. To enhance readability, in all proofs we stick to the convention that if ε and η occur together, then $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$ is chosen so small that $C\eta < c\varepsilon$ for all concrete constants C and c in our proofs that depend only on the model parameters. In particular, the expression $\Omega(\varepsilon) - O(\eta)$ will be positive for all hidden constants that appear in our proofs.

Throughout the paper we will ignore all events of probability 0. For example, we will always assume that V is a finite set, and that all vertices in V have different positions. Furthermore, whenever it does not affect the argument, we omit floors and ceilings.

3. Main results

First of all we show that bootstrap percolation on a $GIRG$ has at threshold with respect to the initial infection rate ρ. Since hyperbolic random graphs are a special instance of GIRGs, this contains in particular the result of [17] on (threshold) hyperbolic random graphs, where the case $\nu = n$ was studied.

Theorem 1. *Consider a bootstrap percolation process on a GIRG $G = (V, E)$ with initial infection rate $\rho = \rho(n) \in [0, 1]$. We set*

$$\rho_c = \rho_c(n) := \nu^{-\frac{1}{\beta-1}}.$$

If the weights follow a strong power-law, then:

- *(i) If $\rho = \omega(\rho_c)$, then $|V^{\leq\infty}| = \Theta(n)$ whp.*
- *(ii) If $\rho = \Theta(\rho_c)$, then $|V^{\leq\infty}| = \Theta(n)$ with probability $\Omega(1)$, but also $V^{\leq\infty} = V^{\leq 0}$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.*
- *(iii) If $\rho = o(\rho_c)$, then $V^{\leq\infty} = V^{\leq 0}$ whp.*

If the weights follow a weak power-law, then:

- *(iv) If there is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\rho \geq \rho_c^{1+\delta}$, then $|V^{\leq\infty}| = \Theta(n)$ whp.*
- *(v) If there is a constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\rho \leq \rho_c^{1-\delta}$, then $V^{\leq\infty} = V^{\leq 0}$ whp.*

Whenever we refer to the *supercritical* regime we mean case (i) and (iv). Similarly, (iii) and (v) form the *subcritical* regime and (ii) is the *critical* regime. Note in particular that there is a supercritical regime regardless of how small the expected number ν of vertices in the starting region is, provided that $\nu = \omega(1)$. This

is in sharp contrast to non-geometric graphs like Chung-Lu graphs, where the expected size of the bootstrap must be polynomial in n (if the bootstrap is chosen at random).

Indeed the proof of Theorem 1 will grant a deeper insight into the evolution of the process. Since the process whp stops immediately in the subcritical regime, we may restrict ourselves to the other cases. We show a doubly logarithmic upper bound on the number of rounds until a constant fraction of all vertices are infected. Furthermore, we prove that this bound is tight up to minor order terms if the influence of the underlying geometry on the random graphs is sufficiently strong ($\alpha > \beta - 1$). Remarkably, the bounds do not depend on the initial infection rate ρ, as long as ρ is supercritical. Moreover, if the expected number ν of vertices in the starting region is sufficiently small (if $\log\log\nu = o(\log\log n)$), then the bound coincides with the average distance in the graph, again up to minor order terms.

Theorem 2. *In the situation of Theorem 1, let $\varepsilon > 0$ be constant and set*

$$i_\infty := \frac{\log\log_\nu n + \log\log n}{|\log(\beta-2)|}.$$

Then in the supercritical regime whp, and in the critical regime with probability $\Omega(1)$ we have $|V^{\leq(1+\varepsilon)i_\infty}| = \Theta(n)$.
If furthermore $\alpha > \beta-1$ and $\nu = n^{o(1)}$ then in all regimes we have whp $|V^{\leq(1-\varepsilon)i_\infty}| = o(n)$.

The proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 can be found in Section 8.

In fact, we can still refine the statement of Theorem 2 tremendously, at least in the case $\alpha > \beta - 1$. In the following, we determine for every fixed vertex v its infection time L_v, up to minor order terms (with the restriction that v may not be too close to the starting region). We will show that it is given by the following expression (see also Remark 6 below).

Definition 3. *For any $x \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus B_0$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ we define*

$$\Lambda(x,w) := \begin{cases} \max\left\{0,\ \frac{\log\log_\nu\left(\|x\|^d n/w\right)}{|\log(\beta-2)|}\right\}, & \text{if } w > (\|x\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)}, \\ \frac{2\log\log_\nu(\|x\|^d n) - \log\log_\nu w}{|\log(\beta-2)|}, & \text{if } w \leq (\|x\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)}. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

In the first case we use the convention that the second term is $-\infty$ if $\|x\|^d n/w < 1$, and thus does not contribute to the maximum.

Note that in the second case, the sign of $\log\log_\nu w$ may be either positive or negative. However, then we have the lower bound $\Lambda(x,w) \geq \log\log_\nu(\|x\|^d n)/|\log(\beta-2)| + O(1)$ due to the upper bound of w and thus, in particular $\Lambda(x,w) \geq 0$, since $x \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus B_0$.

Theorem 4. *Assume we are in the situation of Theorem 1 in the supercritical regime (i) or (iv). Let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be any fixed vertex such that $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus B_0$, $w_v = \omega(1)$ and $\Lambda(x_v, w_v) \leq \log_2(\|x_v\|^d n/\widetilde{\nu}_0)$. Then whp*

$$L_v \leq (1+o(1))\Lambda(x_v,w_v) + O(1). \tag{5}$$

If additionally $\alpha > \beta - 1$ then we also have whp

$$L_v \geq (1-o(1))\Lambda(x_v,w_v) - O(1). \tag{6}$$

As in Theorem 2, the bounds do not depend on the initial infection rate ρ, as long as it is supercritical. Before we come to applications, we give two explanatory remarks on Theorem 4.

Remark 5. *The technical restrictions in Theorem 4 are necessary: if a vertex has weight $w_v = O(1)$ then the number of neighbours is Poisson distributed with mean $\Theta(w_v)$ (see Lemma 12), so v is even isolated with probability $\Omega(1)$. In particular, we cannot expected that whp v is ever infected.*

The restriction $\Lambda(x_v, w_v) \leq \log_2(\|x_v\|^d n/\widetilde{\nu}_0)$ ensures that v is not too close to the starting region. If v is too close, then it may have neighbours inside of B_0, and in this case it does depend on ρ when they are infected. (And of course, this process iterates.) The term $\log_2(\|x_v\|^d n/\widetilde{\nu}_0)$ is not tight and could be improved at the cost of more technical proofs. However, there are already rather few vertices that violate the condition $\Lambda(x_v, w_v) \leq \log_2(\|x_v\|^d n/\widetilde{\nu}_0)$. For example, recall that it only takes $O(\log\log n)$ steps until a constant fraction of all vertices are infected. At this time, we only exclude vertices which satisfy $\|x_v\|^d n \leq \widetilde{\nu}_0 \cdot (\log n)^{O(1)}$, so the expected number of affected vertices is also at most $\widetilde{\nu}_0 \cdot (\log n)^{O(1)}$. Even this is a gross overestimate, since the vertices close to the origin have much smaller infection times L_v, and thus only very few of them are affected by the condition.

Remark 6. *The first case in Definition 3 is not needed if we restrict ourselves to vertices as they typically appear in GIRGs. More precisely, as we will show in Lemma 15, Section 5, whp all vertices in $v = (x_v, w_v) \in V \cap (\mathbb{T}^d \setminus B_0)$ satisfy $w_v \leq (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1-\eta)}$ where $\eta > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. In the border case $(\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)} \leq w_v \leq (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1-\eta)}$ both expressions in (4) agree up to additive constants, i.e.*

$$\Lambda(x_v, w_v) = \frac{2\log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n) - \log\log_\nu w_v}{|\log(\beta-2)|} \pm O(1). \tag{7}$$

Therefore, we could also use (7) as definition for Λ if we would exclude vertices which are unlikely to exist in Theorem 4 .

Finally, we give a strategy how to contain the infection within a certain region when only the starting set and the current round a known, but not the set of infected vertices. Note that the number of edges that need to be removed is substantially smaller than the expected number of vertices $\widetilde{\nu}_i$ in the containment area $\widetilde{B}_i$. The proof can be found in Section 6.2.

Corollary 7. *Assume that we are in the situation of Theorem 1, and that $\alpha > \beta - 1$. If the starting region B_0 is known, then by removing all edges crossing the boundary of $\widetilde{B}_i$ before round $i+1$, whp the infection is contained in $\widetilde{B}_i$. The expected number of edges crossing the boundary of $\widetilde{B}_i$ is $\widetilde{\nu}_i^{\max\{3-\beta, 1-1/d\}+o(1)}$.*

4. Tools

In this section we collect basic tools and observations that we use throughout the paper. We start with a fact which often allows us to treat the case $\alpha = \infty$ along with the case of finite α without case distinction.

Observation 8. *For every function p satisfying (3) and every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{>1}$, there is a function $\bar{p}$ satisfying (2) such that $\bar{p}(x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2) \geq p(x_1, x_2, w_1, w_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{T}^d$ and all $w_1, w_2 \geq w_{min}$.*

In other words, GIRGs in the threshold case $\alpha = \infty$ are dominated by GIRGs with finite α. In particular, whenever we prove an upper bound on the number of active vertices that holds for all GIRGs with finite α, the same upper bound also holds for threshold GIRGs.

In [15], GIRGs were defined with a fixed number of vertices, while we assume the set of vertices to be given by a homogeneous Poisson point process. Our choice allows for slightly less technical proofs. In particular, one of the benefits of the Poisson point process is the following elementary fact.

Fact 9. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and let X be a Poisson distributed random variable with mean λ. Furthermore, given some $0 \leq q \leq 1$, let Y be a random variable which conditioned on $\{X = x\}$, for any $x \in \mathbb{N}_0$, is the sum of x independent Bernoulli random variables with mean q. Then Y is Poisson distributed with mean $q\lambda$.*

This means that for instance $|N_{\geq w}(v) \cap B|$ is Poisson distributed with mean nq, where q denotes the probability that a vertex u with random position x_u and random weight w_u satisfies $w_u \geq w$ and $x_u \in B$, and is a neighbours of v. We will apply this observation throughout the paper without giving explicit reference.

An easy way to bound the expectation

Lemma 10 (Lemma 4.1 in [16])**.** *Let $0 \leq w_0 < w_1$, and let $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a piecewise continuously differentiable function. Then in any finite set V of weighted vertices, we have*

$$\sum_{v \in V, w_0 \leq w_v < w_1} f(w_v) \;=\; f(w_0)|V_{\geq w_0}| \;-\; f(w_1)|V_{\geq w_1}| \;+\; \int_{w_0}^{w_1} |V_{\geq w}| \frac{d}{dw} f(w) dw.$$

Note in particular that if $f(0) = 0$, then, by using $w_0 = 0$ and $w_1 > \max\{w_v \mid v \in V\}$, we have

$$\sum_{v \in V} f(w_v) = \int_0^{w_1} |V_{\geq w}| \frac{d}{dw} f(w) dw = \int_0^{\infty} |V_{\geq w}| \frac{d}{dw} f(w) dw.$$

The lemma is actually formulated slightly more general than Lemma 4.1 in [16]. First, in [16] the lemma was only formulated if V is the vertex set of a GIRG, but their proof does not use this restriction. Second, f was assumed to be everywhere continuously differentiable. However, our version follows immediately by applying Lemma 4.1 in [16] to every continuously differentiable piece, and by noting that all the intermediate terms cancel out.[3]

The next lemma spells out an almost trivial calculation, but since it is ubiquitous in our proofs, we state it as a lemma nevertheless. In our applications, $g(w)$ is typically the number of vertices of weight at least w (possibly with additional restrictions), and f is the probability that such a vertex has a certain property (e.g., that it forms an edge with some fixed v). After application of Lemma 10, this almost always leads to an integral as given in (8) below.

Lemma 11. *Let $g : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a non-zero monomial, and let $f : \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be continuous and piecewise a non-zero monomial with non-negative exponent, for a finite number of pieces. Moreover, assume that there is $\tilde{w}$ such that the exponent*

[3]Formally speaking, the term $\frac{d}{dw} f(w)$ is a distribution and not a function if f is not differentiable everywhere, and the integral is then to be understood as evaluation of the distribution. However, in our simple applications we may just ignore the values where f is not differentiable.

of w in $f(w)g(w)$ is strictly larger than 0 for $w < \tilde{w}$, and strictly smaller than 0 for $w > \tilde{w}$. Then for every $w_0 \le \tilde{w} \le w_1$,

$$\int_{w_0}^{w_1} g(w)\frac{d}{dw}f(w)dw = O(f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w})). \tag{8}$$

Moreover, assume that (i) *the exponent of f is non-zero in an interval $[(1-\Omega(1))\tilde{w}, \tilde{w}] \subseteq [w_0, \tilde{w}]$,* or (ii) *the exponent of f is non-zero in an interval $[\tilde{w}, (1+\Omega(1))\tilde{w}] \subseteq [\tilde{w}, w_1]$. Then the $O(\cdot)$ in (8) may be replaced by $\Theta(\cdot)$.*

Proof. Let $g(w) = Cw^r$. Let us first assume that, by continuity, f satisfies $f(w) = C_0 w^{s_0}$ for $w \le \tilde{w}$ and $f(w) = C_1 w^{s_1}$ for $w \ge \tilde{w}$, i.e. that f consists of only two pieces. Then by assumption $r + s_0 > 0 > r + s_1$. We first consider the lower part of the integral. If $s_0 = 0$ then $(df/dw)(w) = 0$ for $w \le \tilde{w}$, and the integral from w_0 to $\tilde{w}$ vanishes. So assume that $s_0 > 0$. Then $(df/dw)(w) = C_0 s_0 w^{s_0-1}$, and the antiderivative of $g(df/dw)$ is $CC_0 s_0/(r+s_0)w^{r+s_0}$. Since $r + s_0 > 0$, this function is increasing in w, and

$$\int_{w_0}^{\tilde{w}} g(w)\frac{d}{dw}f(w)dw = \frac{CC_0 s_0}{r+s_0}\left(\tilde{w}^{r+s_0} - w_0^{r+s_0}\right) = \Theta(f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w}) - f(w_0)g(w_0)). \tag{9}$$

Note that if $w_0 \le (1-\Omega(1))\tilde{w}$, then $f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w}) - f(w_0)g(w_0) = \Omega(f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w}))$ since fg is a polynomial with positive exponent $r+s_0$ in $[w_0, \tilde{w}]$, which proves the additional statement (i).

For the upper part of the integral, we may assume $s_1 > 0$, since otherwise this part of the integral vanishes. Then $(df/dw)(w) = C_1 s_1 w^{s_1-1}$, and the antiderivative of $g(df/dw)$ is $CC_1 s_1/(r+s_1)w^{r+s_1}$. Note crucially that the sign of this function is negative since $r + s_1 < 0$. Hence,

$$\int_{\tilde{w}}^{w_1} g(w)\frac{d}{dw}f(w)dw = \frac{CC_1 s_1}{-(r+s_1)}\left(\tilde{w}^{r+s_1} - w_1^{r+s_1}\right) = \Theta(f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w}) - f(w_1)g(w_1)). \tag{10}$$

Similarly to the first part, if $w_1 \ge (1+\Omega(1))\tilde{w}$, then $f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w}) - f(w_1)g(w_1) = \Omega(f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w}))$, which proves the additional statement (ii). On the other hand, Equation (8) follows immediately from (9) and (10) by leaving out the negative terms. This proves the lemma in the case that f consists of only two pieces.

For the case of several pieces, the additional statement follows by restricting the integral to the two pieces bounded by $\tilde{w}$. For the upper piece, assume that $w_0 = w_0^{(1)} < \ldots < w_0^{(\lambda)} = \tilde{w}$ are the endpoints of the different pieces below $\tilde{w}$. Then in the same way as (9), we get

$$\int_{w_0}^{\tilde{w}} g(w)\frac{d}{dw}f(w)dw = O(\sum_{i=1}^{\lambda} f(w_0^{(i)})g(w_0^{(i)})) \le O(\lambda f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w})) = O(f(\tilde{w})g(\tilde{w})),$$

since fg is an increasing function in $[w_0, \tilde{w}]$. The part $[\tilde{w}, w_1]$ follows analogously. □

5. Basic properties of GIRGs

In this section we collect some basic properties of GIRGs. The first lemma, taken from [16], tells us that the expected degree of a vertex equals its weight, up to constant factors. Moreover, it gives the marginal probability that two vertices u, v of fixed weights but random positions in $\mathbb{T}^d$ are adjacent. This probability

remains the same if the position of one (but not both) of the vertices is fixed. An expert reader may recognise that it is the same marginal probability as in Chung-Lu random graphs, cf. [16] for a discussion in depth.

Lemma 12 (Lemma 4.4 and Theorem 7.3 in [16])**.** *Let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be a vertex with fixed weight and position. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\deg(v)] = \Theta(w_v). \tag{11}$$

Moreover, let $u = (x_u, w_u)$ be a vertex with fixed weight, but with random position $x_u \in \mathbb{T}^d$. Then

$$\Pr\left[\{u,v\} \in E \mid w_u, w_v, x_v\right] = \Theta\left(\min\left\{\frac{w_u w_v}{n}, 1\right\}\right). \tag{12}$$

Note in particular that the right hand side of (12) *is independent of x_v, so the same formula still applies if also the position x_v of v is randomized.*

The next lemma gives a bound on the expected number of neighbours of a fixed vertex of large weight.

Lemma 13. *Let $\eta > 0$ be a constant and consider a vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ with fixed weight and position. Then for every $w \geq w_{min}$ we have*

(a) $\mathbb{E}[|N_{\geq w}(v)|] = O(\min\{w_v w^{2-\beta+\eta}, nw^{1-\beta+\eta}\})$.
In particular, for a random vertex u we have, independently of x_v and w_v,

$$\Pr[w_u \geq w \mid \{u,v\} \in E] = O(w^{2-\beta+\eta});$$

(b) $\mathbb{E}[|N_{\geq w}(v)|] = \Omega(\min\{w_v w^{2-\beta-\eta}, nw^{1-\beta-\eta}\})$.

Proof. (a) By Lemma 12, the probability that a vertex u with fixed weight w_u and random position $x_u \in \mathbb{T}^d$ is adjacent to v is $\Theta(1)\min\{w_u w_v/n, 1\}$. The expected number of vertices of weight at least w is at most $O(nw^{1-\beta+\eta})$ by the power-law condition (1). We distinguish two cases. If $ww_v \geq n$ then the probability to connect to any vertex of weight w is $\Theta(1)$, so $\mathbb{E}[|N_{\geq w}(v)|] = \Theta(\mathbb{E}[|V_{\geq w}|])$, and the claim follows. So assume $ww_v \leq n$. Then by Lemma 10 we can compute the expectation as the following integral, which we then evaluate using Lemma 11.

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|N_{\geq w}(v)|] &\leq O\left(nw^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{ww_v}{n} + \int_w^\infty nw_u^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw_u}\min\left\{\frac{w_v w_u}{n}, 1\right\} dw_u\right)\\ &\leq O\left(w_v w^{2-\beta+\eta}\right).\end{aligned}$$

We can write both cases uniformly as $\mathbb{E}[|N_{\geq w}(v)|] \leq O(\min\{w_v w^{2-\beta+\eta}, nw^{1-\beta+\eta}\})$.

The second statement follows because the expected total number of neighbours of v is $\Theta(w_v)$. Therefore, the probability that a random neighbour of v has weight at least w is $\Pr[\{u,v\} \in E \wedge w_u \geq w]/\Pr[\{u,v\} \in E] = O(w^{2-\beta-\eta})$, as required.

(b) This follows completely analogously to (a), except that we use that the expected number of vertices of weight at least w is at least $\Omega(nw^{1-\beta-\eta})$ by the lower bound in the power-law condition (1). □

We often need to bound the expected number of neighbours of a given vertex in some geometric region, which we may do by the following lemma.

Lemma 14. *Let $\eta > 0$ and $C > 1$ be constants, define $m := \min\{\alpha, \beta - 1 - \eta\}$ and consider a closed ball $B \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$ of radius $r > 0$ centred at 0. Let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be a vertex with fixed weight and position. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|N(v) \cap B|\right] = O(n\mathrm{Vol}(B)) \cdot \begin{cases} \min\left\{\frac{w_v}{n\mathrm{Vol}(B)}, 1\right\}^m, & \text{if } \|x_v\| \le Cr, \\ \min\left\{\left(\frac{w_v}{\|x_v\|^d n}\right)^m, 1\right\} & \text{if } \|x_v\| \ge Cr. \end{cases}$$

Proof. In the first case $\|x_v\| \le Cr$, the expected number of vertices in B is $n\mathrm{Vol}(B)$, so $\mu \le n\mathrm{Vol}(B)$. On the other hand, the expected number of neighbours of v is $O(w_v)$, so $\mu = O(1)\min\{w_v, n\mathrm{Vol}(B)\}$.

For the second case, as before $\mu \le n\mathrm{Vol}(B)$. This proves the claim in the case $w_v \ge \|x_v\|^d n$, so assume otherwise. Observe that every vertex in B has distance $\Theta(\|x_v\|)$ from v, and that the expected number of vertices in B of weight at least w is $O(n\mathrm{Vol}(B)w^{1-\beta+\eta})$.

Consider first the case $\alpha < \beta - 1 - \eta$. Then by Lemma 10,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|N(v) \cap B|\right] \le O\left(n\mathrm{Vol}(B)\min\left\{\left(\frac{w_v}{\|x_v\|^d n}\right)^\alpha, 1\right\} + \int_{w_{\min}}^\infty n\mathrm{Vol}(B)w^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw}\min\left\{\left(\frac{ww_v}{\|x_v\|^d n}\right)^\alpha, 1\right\}dw\right).$$

Note that the exponent of w in the integrand is always negative, no matter which value the minimum attains. Moreover, recall that we assumed $w_v < \|x_v\|^d n$ and hence for $w = w_{\min}$ the minimum is $O((w_v/(\|x_v\|^d n))^\alpha)$. Thus by Lemma 11 (with $\tilde{w} = w_{\min} = \Theta(1)$), the integral also evaluates to $O(n\mathrm{Vol}(B)\cdot\min\{(w_v/(\|x_v\|^d n))^\alpha, 1\})$, as required.

On the other hand, if $\alpha + 1 - \beta + \eta \ge 0$, then by Observation 8 we may restrict ourselves to $\alpha < \infty$, so we can estimate using Lemma 10 (with lower bound 0)

$$\mathbb{E}\left[|N(v) \cap B|\right] = O\left(\int_0^\infty n\mathrm{Vol}(B)w^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw}\min\left\{\left(\frac{ww_v}{\|x_v\|^d n}\right)^\alpha, 1\right\}dw\right).$$

This integral evaluates to $O(n\mathrm{Vol}(B)\cdot(w_v/(\|x_v\|^d n))^{\beta-1-\eta})$, by Lemma 11 (with $\tilde{w} = \|x_v\|^d n/w_v$). Since we have already shown that $\mathbb{E}\left[|N(v) \cap B|\right] \le n\mathrm{Vol}(B)$, this proves the claim. □

In the last lemma of this section we show that whp there are no vertices whose weight is much larger than their distance from the origin.

Lemma 15. *Let $\eta > 0$ be a constant and consider a closed ball $B \subseteq \mathbb{T}^d$ of radius $r > 0$ centred at 0, satisfying $n\mathrm{Vol}(B) = \Theta(r^d n) = \omega(1)$. Then with probability $1 - (r^d n)^{-\Omega(\eta)}$ there is no vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ with $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus B$ and $w_v \ge \hat{w}_+(\|x_v\|^d n)$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{n}$ be the number of such vertices. Let $r' > r$, then the probability density to find a vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ with $\|x_v\| = r'$ is equal to the volume of an r'-sphere around 0 that is intersected with $\mathbb{T}^d$. By ignoring the intersection, we can only make the volume larger, so it is at most $O((r')^{d-1}n)$. Moreover, the probability that a vertex has weight at least w is at most $O(w^{1-\beta+\eta/2})$ by the power-law condition (1) (using $\gamma = \eta/2$). Hence, by Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{n}\right] = O(1)\int_r^\infty (r')^{d-1}n((r')^d n)^{(1-\beta+\eta/2)/(\beta-1-\eta)}dr' = (r^d n)^{-\Omega(\eta)},$$

and the statement follows by Markov's inequality. □

6. Evolution of the process

In this section we will prove two theorems which describe the geometrical evolution of the process in detail. First we show that certain regions cannot be reached too early in the process, providing an *upper bound on its speed*. From this we then derive Corollary 7 in Section 6.2. Afterwards, we show that in the supercritical regime the process will reach certain regions whp in a given time, yielding a *lower bound on its speed*. This lower bound also applies in the critical regime if in the first step sufficiently many heavy vertices were activated, an event which holds with at least constant probability.

6.1. Upper bound on the speed.

The key theorem will recursively assert that the process does not infect too many vertices in certain regions in any round. We formalise this idea by defining several families of events.

Definition 16. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant and let $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$ be a constant which is sufficiently small compared to ε, cf. Section 2.3. Moreover, let $h = h(n)$ be a function satisfying $h(n) = \omega(1)$, $h(n) = o(\log n)$, and $h(n) = \nu^{o(1)}$. Then we define the following families of events:*

- *For all $i \geq 0$*
$$\mathcal{E}(i) := \{V^{\leq i} \cap (\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \widetilde{B}_i) = \emptyset\},$$
in other words, no vertex outside of $\widetilde{B}_i$ is activated by time i;
- *For all $\ell \geq 0$ and $w \geq w_{min}$*
$$\mathcal{F}(\ell, w) := \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,\eta,h}(\ell, w) := \left\{ \left| V_{\geq w}^{\leq \ell} \cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0 \right| \leq h^\ell w^{2-\beta+\eta} \widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(\beta-1)^{-1}} \right\},$$
and
$$\mathcal{F}(\ell) := \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon,\eta,h}(\ell) := \bigcap_{w' \geq w_{min}} \mathcal{F}(\ell, w'),$$
i.e. the number of vertices in $2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0$ being activated by time ℓ is not "too large";
- *For all $j \geq 0$*
$$\mathcal{G}(j) := \mathcal{G}_{\varepsilon,\eta,h}(j) := \bigcap_{j'=0}^{j} (\mathcal{E}(j') \cap \mathcal{F}(j')),$$
in other words, it is all "good" events up to time j hold.

Theorem 17. *Let ε, η, h be given as in Definition 16 and assume $\alpha > \beta - 1$. Then, for sufficiently large n,*

(a) $\mathcal{E}(0)$ is always satisfied;
(b) $\Pr[\mathcal{F}(0)] \geq 1 - O(h^{-1})$;
(c) For all $i \geq 1$ we have
$$\Pr\left[\mathcal{E}(i) \mid \mathcal{G}(i-1)\right] \geq 1 - h^{-\Omega(i)};$$
(d) For all $\ell \geq 1$ we have
$$\Pr\left[\mathcal{F}(\ell) \mid \mathcal{G}(\ell-1)\right] \geq 1 - h^{-\Omega(\ell)};$$
(e) Whp, the events $\mathcal{G}(j)$ hold for all $j \geq 0$;

(f) For all $i \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 0$, and for every fixed vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ such that $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$ and $w_v \geq w_{min}$ we have

$$\Pr\left[v \in V^{\leq i+\ell} \;\middle|\; \mathcal{G}(i+\ell-1)\right] \leq w_v 2^{\ell d} \widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)}.$$

Proof. First note that all statements only become easier if the edge probabilities are decreased. Hence, by Observation 8 we may restrict ourselves to the case $\alpha < \infty$, since this case dominates the case $\alpha = \infty$.

To prove (c), (d), and (f), we will use induction on $i+\ell$, where we set $\ell = 0$ and $i = 0$ in (c) and (d), respectively. In particular, in order to prove (c) and (d) for i, ℓ, we will assume statement (f) for i', ℓ' as long as $i' + \ell' \leq i + \ell - 1$. Throughout the proof, we will mutually assume that n is sufficiently large; for example, we will use that h and $\widetilde{\nu}_0$ are larger than any fixed constant without further comment.

(a) This statement is trivial since only vertices in $B_0 \subseteq \widetilde{B}_0$ are active at time 0.

(b) Fix a weight $w \geq w_{\min}$ and note that

$$\left|V_{\geq w}^{\leq 0} \cap \widetilde{B}_0\right| \leq \left|V_{\geq w} \cap B_0\right|$$

since initially activation only occurs within B_0. Furthermore, the right-hand side is a Poisson distributed random variable and we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|V_{\geq w} \cap B_0|] \leq O(\nu w^{1-\beta+\eta}) = O(w^{2-\beta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta-1}-\Omega(\varepsilon)} w^{-1+\eta}) \leq O(w^{2-\beta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{\frac{\beta-2}{\beta-1}-\Omega(\varepsilon)}), \tag{13}$$

where in the last step we used that $w^{-1+\eta} = O(1)$. Let $\bar{w}$ be the weight that satisfies $\bar{w}^{2-\beta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\beta-2)/(\beta-1)} = h$. Then by Markov's inequality, $\left|V_{\geq \bar{w}}^{\leq 0} \cap \widetilde{B}_0\right| = 0$ with probability $1 - O(\widetilde{\nu}_0^{-\Omega(\varepsilon)} h) = 1 - O(h^{-1})$ since $h = \widetilde{\nu}_0^{o(1)}$. Note that this implies (b) for all $w \geq \bar{w}$.

For smaller w, observe in (13) that $\widetilde{\nu}_0^{-\Omega(\varepsilon)}$ dominates every $O(1)$-term for sufficiently large n. Let $\mathcal{F}_*(0, w)$ be the event that $\left|V_{\geq w} \cap B_0\right| \leq (2w)^{2-\beta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\beta-2)/(\beta-1)}$ and note that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{F}_*(0, w)] \geq 1 - \exp\left[-\Omega(1)(2w)^{2-\beta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\beta-2)/(\beta-1)}\right] \tag{14}$$

by (13) and a Chernoff bound. The exponent $(\beta-2)/(\beta-1)$ in (14) equals the exponent $1-(\beta-1)^{-1}$ of $\widetilde{\nu}_0$ in $\mathcal{F}(0, w)$. Hence, if $\mathcal{F}_*(0, w')$ holds for some $w' \geq w_{\min}$, then $\mathcal{F}(0, w)$ holds for all $w \in [w', 2w']$. Therefore, it remains to prove $\mathcal{F}_*(0, 2^s w_{\min})$ for all $s \in \{0, \dots, \log_2(\bar{w}/w_{\min}) - 1\}$. A union bound over all such s using (14) shows that all these events hold with probability $1 - \exp\{-\Omega(h)\} = 1 - O(h^{-1})$. This concludes the proof of (b).

(c) We will show that with sufficiently large probability, no vertex in $\mathbb{T}^d \setminus \widetilde{B}_i$ has a neighbour in $\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$. This will imply the statement, since we assumed $\mathcal{G}(i-1)$, which means in particular that all active vertices in round $i-1$ are in $\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$.

By Lemma 15, with probability $1 - \widetilde{\nu}_i^{-\Omega(\eta)} \geq 1 - h^{-\Omega(i)}$ there is no vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ such that $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \widetilde{B}_i$ and $w_v \geq \hat{w}_+(\|x_v\|^d n)$. So let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be a vertex satisfying $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \widetilde{B}_i$ and $w_v \leq \hat{w}_+(\|x_v\|^d n)$, and note in particular that $\|x_v\| \geq (\widetilde{\nu}_i/n)^{1/d} \geq 2(\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}/n)^{1/d}$. Hence, due to Markov's inequality, the

probability of v having a neighbour in $\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$ is at most

$$\mathbb{E}[N(v)\cap \widetilde{B}_{i-1}] = O(1)\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}\left(\frac{w_v}{\|x_v\|^d n}\right)^{\beta-1-\eta}$$

by Lemma 14. We call any such vertex $v=(x_v,w_v)$ *bad*, i.e. v is bad if it satisfies $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \widetilde{B}_i$ and $w_v \le \hat{w}_+(\|x_v\|^d n)$, and if v has at least one neighbour in $\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$. Integrating over $r_v := \|x_v\|$ and using Lemma 10, we can thus bound the expected number n_{bad} of bad vertices by

$$\mathbb{E}[n_{\text{bad}}] = O(1)\int_{(\widetilde{\nu}_i/n)^{1/d}}^{\infty} r_v^{d-1} n \int_{w_{\min}}^{\hat{w}_+(r_v^d n)} w_v^{1-\beta+2\eta}\frac{d}{dw_v}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}(r_v^d n)^{1-\beta+\eta} w_v^{\beta-1-\eta} dw_v dr_v.$$

Thus, since $(\hat{w}_+(r_v^d n))^\eta = (r_v^d n)^{\eta/(\beta-1-\eta)} \le (r_v^d n)^\eta$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[n_{\text{bad}}] = O(1)\int_{(\widetilde{\nu}_i/n)^{1/d}}^{\infty} r_v^{-1}(r^d n)^{2-\beta+2\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1} dr_v = O(1)\widetilde{\nu}_i^{2-\beta+2\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1} = \widetilde{\nu}_i^{2\eta-\Omega(\varepsilon)}.$$

Thus by Markov's inequality, with probability at least $1-\widetilde{\nu}_i^{2\eta-\Omega(\varepsilon)} \ge 1-h^{-\Omega(i)}$ there is no such vertex. Statement (c) follows.

(d) We distinguish two cases. For $w \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(1+3\eta)/(\beta-1)}$, we consider the upper bound

$$\left|V_{\ge w}^{\le \ell}\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0\right| \le \left|V_{\ge w}\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0\right|.$$

Since we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{\ge w}\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0\right|\right] = O(1)2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_0 w^{1-\beta+\eta} = O(1)w^{2-\beta}2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(1+\eta)/(\beta-1)},$$

and since this number is Poisson distributed, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\left[\left|V_{\ge w}\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0\right| \le 2(2w)^{2-\beta}2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}\right] \\ \ge 1-\exp\left[-\Omega(1)w^{2-\beta}2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

by a Chernoff bound. Similarly as in the proof of (b), it suffices to establish the bound in (15) only for weights of the form $2^s w_{\min}$ for $s \in \{0,\dots,\log_2(\bar{w}_\ell/w_{\min})-1\}$, where $\bar{w}_\ell$ is defined by $\bar{w}_\ell^{2-\beta}2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)} = h^\ell$. A union bound over all such s proves that (b) holds for all $w \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(1+3\eta)/(\beta-1)}$ with probability $1-\exp(-\Omega(h^\ell)) = 1-h^{-\Omega(\ell)}$.

For the second case assume that $w \le \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(1+3\eta)/(\beta-1)}$. We claim that it suffices to restrict ourselves to vertices of weight at most $\hat{w} := \hat{w}_+^0(\widetilde{\nu}_0) = \widetilde{\nu}_0^{1/(\beta-1)}$. More precisely, we will show that with probability at least $1-h^{-\Omega(\ell)}$, for all $w \le \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(1+3\eta)/(\beta-1)}$ we have

$$|U(w)| \le h^\ell w^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}, \tag{16}$$

where $U(w) := V_{\in[w,\hat{w}]}^{\le\ell}\cap 2^\ell\widetilde{B}_0$. This suffices since by the first case there are sufficiently few other vertices active: we have seen that with probability at least $1-h^{-\Omega(\ell)}$ for any $w \le \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(\beta-1)^{-1}(1+3\eta)} = o(\hat{w})$ (for $\ell \ge 1$) we have

$$\left|V_{\ge \hat{w}}^{\le\ell}\cap 2^\ell\widetilde{B}_0\right| \le h^\ell \hat{w}^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)} \le \frac{1}{2}h^\ell w^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}.$$

Thus we want to bound $\mathbb{E}[|U|]$ by calculating the expected number of edges having one endpoint in $V^{\leq \ell-1}$ and the other in $V_{\in[w,\hat{w}]} \cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0$, i.e. we set

$$M(w) := E\left(V^{\leq \ell-1}, V_{\in[w,\hat{w}]} \cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0\right).$$

Furthermore we observe that each edge in $M(w)$ is also contained in at least one of the following two edge-sets: Let

$$M_*(w) := E\left(V^{\leq \ell-1} \cap 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0, V_{\in[w,\hat{w}]}\right),$$

and

$$M^*(w) := E\left(V \cap (\mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0), V_{\in[w,\hat{w}]} \cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0\right),$$

then we have $M(w) \subseteq M_*(w) \cup M^*(w)$. It will turn out that the bound on $|U(w)| \leq |M_*(w)| + |M^*(w)|$ obtained this way strong enough to prove (16).

We start by estimating $|M_*(w)|$. As a preparation, we first bound $\left|V_{\geq w'}^{\leq \ell-1} \cap 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0\right|$, i.e. the number of vertices in a slightly larger region that were already active in the previous round. Since we assumed that $\mathcal{F}(\ell-1)$ holds, for those vertices which are also contained in the slightly smaller region $2^{\ell-1}\widetilde{B}_0$ we already know that

$$\left|V_{\geq w'}^{\leq \ell-1} \cap 2^{\ell-1}\widetilde{B}_0\right| \leq 2^{(\ell-1)d}(w')^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1)}. \tag{17}$$

Now if $\ell = 1$, then no other vertices were active in round $\ell - 1 = 0$ by (a). For $\ell \geq 2$, we need to examine the remaining region $2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0 \setminus 2^{\ell-1}\widetilde{B}_0$. Note that this area is contained in $2^\ell \widetilde{B}_1$. Hence, we may apply (f) with $i' = 1$ and $\ell' = \ell - 2$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{\geq w'}^{\leq \ell-1} \cap (2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0 \setminus 2^{\ell-1}\widetilde{B}_0)\right|\right] &= O(1)2^{(\ell+1)d}\widetilde{\nu}_0(w')^{1-\beta+\eta}w'2^{(\ell-2)d}\widetilde{\nu}_1^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)} \\ &= O(1)h^\ell(w')^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1)}. \end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

Combining equations (17) and (18) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{\geq w'}^{\leq \ell-1} \cap 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0\right|\right] = O(1)\min\left\{h^\ell(w')^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-\frac{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}}{\beta-1}}, 2^{(\ell+1)d}\widetilde{\nu}_0(w')^{1-\beta+\eta}\right\}, \tag{19}$$

where the second term arises from dropping the condition on being active in round $i-1$. Now we denote by $\tilde{w} = \Theta(1)\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}(\beta-1)^{-1}}2^{(\ell+1)d}h^{-\ell}$ the weight for which the two expressions in (19) coincide. Recall that for any vertex $u = (x_u, w_u)$ of fixed weight (and independently of its position) we have $\mathbb{E}[|N(u)|] = \Theta(w_u)$ by Lemma 12. Moreover, by Lemma 13, the probability $q(w)$ for a random neighbour of u to have weight at least w is $O(w^{2-\beta+\eta/2})$, independently of u. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|M_*(w)|] &= O(q(w)) \sum_{u \in V_{\geq 0}^{\leq \ell-1} \cap\, 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0} \mathbb{E}[|N(u)|] \\ &\overset{L.10}{=} O(q(w)) \int_0^\infty \min\left\{h^\ell w_u^{2-\beta+\eta}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-\frac{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}}{\beta-1}}, 2^{(\ell+1)d}\widetilde{\nu}_0 w_u^{1-\beta+\eta}\right\}\left(\frac{d}{dw_u}w_u\right)dw_u.\end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 11 with $\tilde{w}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|M_*(w)|] &= O(1)w^{2-\beta+\eta/2}2^{(\ell+1)d}\widetilde{\nu}_0\tilde{w}^{2-\beta+\eta}\\ &= O(1)w^{2-\beta+\eta/2}2^{(\ell+1)d(3-\beta+\eta)}h^{\ell(\beta-2-\eta)}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}(\beta-2+\eta)/(\beta-1)}\\ &\le w^{2-\beta+\eta/2}h^{\ell(\beta-2-2\eta)}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}(1+\Omega(\varepsilon)-O(\eta))/(\beta-1)}\\ &\le w^{2-\beta+\eta/2}h^{\ell(\beta-2-2\eta)}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}. \qquad (20)\end{aligned}$$

Next we turn to the edges in $M^*(w)$. If $\ell = 1$, then $V^{\le \ell-1}\cap(\mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_0)$ is empty by (a), hence also $M^*(w)$. So assume $\ell \ge 2$. Fix a vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ such that $x_v \in 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_0$ and $w_v \le \hat{w}$ and denote by $M^*(w,v) := \{e \in M^*(w) \mid v \in e\}$ the subset of $M^*(w)$ consisting of all edges incident with v. Now note that every edge in $M^*(w,v)$ must bridge a distance of at least $\tilde{r}_\ell := 2^\ell(\widetilde{\nu}_0/n)^{1/d}$ and hence Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 imply

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|M^*(w,v)|\right] &= O(1)\int_{r_\ell}^\infty r^{d-1}n\int_0^\infty w_*^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw_*}\min\left\{\left(\frac{w_*w_v}{r^dn}\right)^\alpha, 1\right\}dw_*dr\\ &= O(1)\int_{\tilde{r}_\ell}^\infty r^{d-1}n\left(\frac{r^dn}{w_v}\right)^{1-\beta+\eta}dr = O(1)(\tilde{r}_\ell^d n)^{2-\beta+\eta}w_v^{\beta-1+\eta}\\ &= O(1)\left(\frac{2^{d\ell}\widetilde{\nu}_0}{w_v}\right)^{2-\beta+\eta}w_v = O(1)\widetilde{\nu}_0^{-\frac{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}}{\beta-1}}w_v,\end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from $(\beta-2)(\beta-2-\eta)(\zeta+\varepsilon)^2 \ge 1$ since we assumed $w_v \le \hat{w} = \widetilde{\nu}_0^{1/(\beta-1)}$ and $\ell \ge 2$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|M^*(w)|] &= O(1)\widetilde{\nu}_0\int_w^\infty w_v^{1-\beta+\eta/2}\frac{d}{dw_v}\left(\widetilde{\nu}_0^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}w_v\right)dw_v\\ &\le O(1)w^{2-\beta+\eta/2}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}.\end{aligned}$$

Together with (20), this shows that the expected number of vertices in $U(w)$ is also bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}[|U(w)|] \le 2w^{2-\beta+\eta/2}h^{\ell(\beta-2-2\eta)}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)},$$

and therefore, by Markov's inequality, we have

$$\Pr\left[|U(w)| \ge \frac{1}{2}(2w)^{2-\beta+\eta}h^\ell\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}\right] = w^{-\eta/2}h^{-\Omega(\ell)}.$$

As in the proof of (b), by a union bound over all weights of the form $2^s w_{\min}$ for $s \in \{0,\dots,\log_2(\hat{w}/w_{\min})-1\}$, we find that with probability $1-h^{-\Omega(\ell)}$, for all $w \ge w_{\min}$ we have

$$|U(w)| \le \frac{1}{2}w^{2-\beta+\eta}h^\ell\widetilde{\nu}_0^{1-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1)}, \qquad (21)$$

concluding the proof of (d).

(e) This follows from (a)–(d) by a simple union bound.

(f) Fix a vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ such that $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$. The statement (f) is trivial if $w_v \ge \widetilde{\nu}_i^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)}$, so assume the contrary. We first estimate the number of neighbours in $2^\ell\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$. Observe that every such vertex has distance

at least $\tilde{r}_{i-1,\ell} := 2^\ell(\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}/n)^{1/d}$ of v. Therefore, using $w_v \le \widetilde{\nu}_i^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)} \le \widetilde{\nu}_i^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-2}/(\beta-1)}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|N(v)\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_{i-1}\right|\right] &= O(1)2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}\int_0^\infty w^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw}\min\left\{\left(\frac{ww_v}{2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}}\right)^\alpha, 1\right\}dw\\ &\overset{L.\ 11,\alpha>\beta-1}{=} O(1)w_v\left(\frac{2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}}{w_v}\right)^{2-\beta+\eta}\\ &= O(1)w_v 2^{\ell d}\left(\widetilde{\nu}_i^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-1}-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-2}/(\beta-1)}\right)^{2-\beta+\eta}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(2-\beta-\eta)[(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-1}-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-2}/(\beta-1)] = -(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-2}(1+\Omega(\varepsilon))/(\beta-1)$ we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left|N(v)\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_{i-1}\right|\right] &= O(1)w_v 2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-2}/(\beta-1)-\Omega(\varepsilon)}\\ &\le \frac{1}{2}w_v 2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)}. \qquad (22)\end{aligned}$$

In the case $\ell = 0$, this already proves the assertion since in round $i-1$ no vertex outside of $\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$ is active by $\mathcal{E}(i-1)$, and thus $\Pr[v \in V^{=i}] \le \mathbb{E}[N(v)\cap 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_{i-1}]$.

So assume $\ell \ge 1$. Set $U_* := \left|N^{\le i+\ell-1}(v)\cap(\mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2^\ell \widetilde{B}_{i-1})\right|$. In this case, we can use the induction hypothesis of statement (f) for $i' = i$ and $\ell' = \ell - 1$ to estimate $\mathbb{E}[|U_*|] =$

$$O(1)\int_0^\infty r^{d-1}n\int_0^\infty w^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw}\left(\min\{wh^\ell\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-\frac{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}}{\beta-1}}, 1\}\min\{\left(\frac{ww_v}{r^d n}\right)^\alpha, 1\}\right)dwdr.$$

To compute this integral, note that whenever the second minimum is attained by 1, the inner integral runs either over a polynomial in w with exponent $1-\beta+\eta < -1$, or over the zero function. On the other hand, whenever the second minimum is is attained by the expression $(ww_v/(r^d n))^\alpha$, then the inner integral runs over a a polynomial in w with exponent larger than -1 (either with exponent $\alpha-\beta+\eta > -1$, or even with exponent $\alpha-\beta+\eta+1$). Therefore, by Lemma 11 for $\tilde{w} = r^d n/w_v$, we obtain in all cases

$$\mathbb{E}[|U_*|] = O(1)\int_0^\infty r^{d-1}n\left(\frac{r^d n}{w_v}\right)^{1-\beta+\eta}\min\left\{\left(\frac{r^d n}{w_v}\right)h^\ell\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}/(\beta-1)}, 1\right\}dr.$$

Similarly, let r_* be defined by $r_*^d n/w_v = h^{-\ell}\widetilde{\nu}_i^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}/(\beta-1)}$, then the exponent of r in the antiderivative of the integrand is positive for all $r < r_*$ and negative for all $r > r_*$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[|U_*|] = O(1)w_v\left(h^\ell\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}/(\beta-1)}\right)^{\beta-2-\eta} \le \frac{1}{2}w_v 2^{\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-2)}, \quad (23)$$

since $(\zeta+\varepsilon)(\beta-2-\eta) \ge 1$ and $h = \omega(1)$. Together, equations (22) and (23) prove the claim. □

6.2. **Isolation strategies: Proof of Corollary 7.**

Proof. By Theorem 17, whp there is no vertex outside of $\widetilde{B}_i$ which is active in round i. Therefore, it suffices to (permanently) remove by the end of round i all edges that cross the boundary of $\widetilde{B}_i$, i.e. all edges in $E(\widetilde{B}_i, \mathbb{T}^d \setminus \widetilde{B}_i)$. This is very similar to [15, Lemma 7.1 and Theorem 7.2], where the number of edges cutting a

grid is considered. It does not follow directly from this lemma since the error terms in [15] are too large for our purposes. However, what *does* follow directly from their proof is that among those edges that are completely contained in $2\widetilde{B}_i$, the number of edges that cross a fixed axis-parallel hyperplane is at most $\widetilde{\nu}_i^{\max\{3-\beta,1-1/d\}+o(1)}$. Since the boundary of $\widetilde{B}_i$ consists of a constant number of faces, this proves the bound for those edges which have both endpoints in $2\widetilde{B}_i$.

So it remains to consider the set $M_i := E(\widetilde{B}_i, \mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2\widetilde{B}_i)$. Let $\eta > 0$ be any constant, and let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be a vertex such that $x_v \in \mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2\widetilde{B}_i$. Then by Lemma 14 (in the case $\alpha > \beta - 1$) the expected number of neighbours of v inside of $\widetilde{B}_i$ is

$$\mathbb{E}[N(v) \cap \widetilde{B}_i] = O(\widetilde{\nu}_i) \min\left\{ \left(\frac{w_v}{\|x_v\|^d n} \right)^{\beta-1-\eta}, 1 \right\}.$$

Note that v has distance at least $r_i := (\widetilde{\nu}_i/n)^{1/d}$ from the origin. Thus we may use Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 to estimate

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|M_i|] &= O(1) \int_{r_i}^{\infty} r^{d-1} n \int_0^{\infty} w_v^{1-\beta+2\eta} \frac{d}{dw_v} \widetilde{\nu}_i \min\left\{ \left(\frac{w_v}{r^d n} \right)^{\beta-1-\eta}, 1 \right\} dw_v dr \\ &= O(\widetilde{\nu}_i) \int_{r_i}^{\infty} r^{-1} (r^d n)^{2-\beta+2\eta} dr = O(\widetilde{\nu}_i^{3-\beta+2\eta}).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\widetilde{\nu}_i = \omega(1)$, we can deduce that $\mathbb{E}[|M_i|] \le \widetilde{\nu}_i^{3-\beta+3\eta}$ for sufficiently large n. Since this holds for all $\eta > 0$, the claim follows. □

6.3. **Lower bound on the speed.** In this section we show lower bounds for the probability that a vertex in a specific region and with a specific weight will be active in some round, provided that we start in the supercritical case. Recall that the supercritical case is defined by $\rho = \omega(\rho_c)$ for strong power-law weights, and $\rho = \omega(\nu^{-1/(\beta-1-\eta)})$ otherwise. The same bounds also hold in the critical case if at least k "heavy" vertices are activated in the first round, which happens with probability $\Omega(1)$.

The key idea is that the infection spreads in two ways: *(i)* from heavy vertices in one region to heavy vertices in the next (surrounding) region, where the volume of the region increases by an exponent of $\zeta - \varepsilon$ in each step, and *(ii)* from vertices of weight w to nearby vertices of weight $w^{1/(\zeta-\varepsilon)}$. We formalise the occurring weights with the following definitions.

Definition 18. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant and let $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$ be a constant which is sufficiently small compared to ε, cf. Section 2.3. For any integers $i \ge 0$ and $\ell \ge 0$, we define*

$$w_{i,\ell} := \hat{w}_-(\nu_i)^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}} = \nu_i^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1+\eta)} = \nu^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{i-\ell}/(\beta-1+\eta)}.$$

We abbreviate the set of all vertices in B_i of weight at least at least $w_{i,0}$ by $U_i := V_{\ge w_{i,0}} \cap B_i$, and we call such vertices heavy *if the value of i is clear from the context. As usual, superscripts in the notation denote active vertices, so $U_i^{\le j} := V_{\ge w_{i,0}}^{\le j} \cap B_i$. Furthermore we denote by $\mathcal{H}(i)$ the event that in round $i+3$ all vertices in U_i are active.*

The following theorem gives lower bounds on the probability that a vertex is active in some round. It agrees with the above intuition in the following sense: if j

is the first round in which a vertex has, say, probability 1/2 to be active according to the bound in Theorem 19 (c), then j agrees with the round that is predicted by the above intuition, up to additive constants. We will see in Section 7 that Theorem 17 provides matching lower bounds on j, up to minor order terms. So in this sense, Theorem 19 is tight.

Theorem 19. *Let ε and η be as in Definition 18. Assume furthermore that we are in the supercritical case, or instead that $|U_i^{\leq 1}| \geq k$. Then the following is true:*

(a) Whp $|U_i| = \nu_i^{\Omega(\eta)}$ and $|U_i| = O(\nu_i)$ uniformly for all $i \geq 0$.
(b) Whp all the events $\mathcal{H}(i)$ occur.
(c) There exist constants $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that the following holds: Let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be any vertex with fixed position and weight and let $i, \ell \geq 0$ be such that $x_v \in B_i$ and $w_v \geq \max\{w_{i,\ell}, C_0\}$. Then for sufficiently large $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\Pr[v \in V^{\leq i+3+\ell} \mid \mathcal{H}(0), \dots, \mathcal{H}(i)] \geq 1 - \exp\left[-C_1 \nu_i^{C_2(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}}\right].$$

Before we prove Theorem 19, we remark the following.

Remark 20. *Our proof will in fact show that (c) still holds if we replace B_i by an arbitrary ball of the same volume, and that it suffices if only a constant fraction of all heavy vertices is active. More precisely, let B be any ball, and let $\mathcal{H}(i', B)$ be the event that in round i' at least half of the vertices in B of weight at least $\hat{w}_-(n\mathrm{Vol}(B))$ are active. Then there are constants $C_0, C_1, C_2 > 0$ such that for any vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ with fixed position $x_v \in B$, and with fixed weight $w_v \geq \max\left\{(n\mathrm{Vol}(B))^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1+\eta)}, C_0\right\}$ we have*

$$\Pr[v \in V^{\leq i'+\ell} \mid \mathcal{H}(i', B)] \geq 1 - \exp\left[-C_1 (n\mathrm{Vol}(B))^{C_2(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}}\right].$$

For the sake of readability, we omit the details and prove Theorem (19) only in the case $B = B_i$.

Proof of Theorem 19. (a) By definition of U_i,

$$\mathbb{E}[|U_i|] \geq \nu_i w_{i,0}^{1-\beta-\eta/2} = \nu_i^{\Omega(\eta)}.$$

The random variable $|U_i|$ is Poisson distributed. Therefore, we have $\Pr[|U_i| \leq \mathbb{E}[|U_i|]/2] \leq e^{-\Omega(\mathbb{E}[|U_i|])}$. By a union bound over all i, we see that whp $|U_i| \geq \nu_i^{\Omega(\eta)}$ for all $i \geq 0$. Similarly, the upper bound follows since $0 \ll \mathbb{E}[|U_i|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|B_i|] = O(\nu_i)$.

(b) We first show that in the supercritical case for weak power-law weights, whp $|U_0^{\leq 1}| \geq k$. Let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be a vertex in U_0. Then we claim that in round 1, such a vertex will be active with at least constant probability. We may restrict ourselves to the case $w_v \leq \nu$, since larger weights make it only easier to become active. Consider a ball around v with the property that every vertex of weight at least $w_{\min}$ (so *all* vertices) in this ball have probability $\Omega(1)$ to connect to v. Observe that by condition (2) and (3) on the edge probabilities we may choose the ball to have volume $\Omega(w_v/n)$. (For $\alpha < \infty$ we may choose the volume to be exactly w_v/n, for $\alpha = \infty$ we may have to choose it smaller by at most a constant factor.) Since $w_v \leq \nu$, at least a constant fraction of this ball lies in B_0. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[|N^{\leq 0}(v)|] = \Omega(\rho w_v) = \omega(1)$. Since $|N^{\leq 0}(v)|$ is a Poisson distributed random variable, v becomes active with high probability. In particular, if we fix any k

vertices in U_0 then whp all k of them will be active in round 1. This implies that whp $|U_0^{\leq 1}| \geq k$, as claimed.

Next we show that $|U_0^{\leq 1}| \geq k$ implies that whp at least an $\Omega(1)$ fraction of all vertices in U_0 is active in round 2. For $\alpha < \infty$, any two vertices in U_0 have probability at least $\Omega(\min\{w_0^2/\nu, 1\}) = \Omega(1)$ to be adjacent, independently of each other. For $\alpha = \infty$, the probability is also $\Omega(1)$ since $w_0^2/\nu = \omega(1)$. Hence, by the Chernoff bound, whp $|U_0^{\leq 2}| = \Omega(|U_0|)$.

We show that the same holds in the supercritical case for strong power-law weights, i.e. whp at least an $\Omega(1)$ fraction of U_0 is active in round 2. Recall that $\rho = \omega(\nu^{-1/(\beta-1)})$ since we are supercritical. Let ρ' be a function with the properties $\rho' = o(\rho)$, $\rho' = o(1/w_0) = o(\nu^{-1/(\beta-1+\eta)})$, and $\rho' = \omega(\nu^{-1/(\beta-1)})$, and let $w' := 1/\rho'$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[|V_{\geq w'} \cap B_0|] = \Omega((w')^{1-\beta}\nu) = \omega(1)$. As for weak power-laws, for a vertex v of weight at least w', we consider a ball B around v of volume w'/n. In the case $\alpha < \infty$, every vertex in B has probability $\Omega(\min\{w_{\min}w'/w', 1\}) = \Omega(1)$ to connect to v. In the case $\alpha = \infty$, we may achieve the same by shrinking the ball B by at most a constant factor. In either case, the expected number of vertices in $V^{\leq 0} \cap B$ is $\rho n \mathrm{Vol}(B) = \Omega(\rho/\rho') = \omega(1)$. Hence, every vertex in $V_{\geq w'} \cap B_0$ is in $V^{\leq 1}$ with probability $1 - o(1)$. By Markov's inequality, whp the number of vertices in $V_{\geq w'} \cap B_0$ that are *not* in $V^{\leq 1}$ is $o(\mathbb{E}[|V_{\geq w'} \cap B_0|])$. In particular, whp $|V_{\geq w'}^{\leq 1} \cap B_0| = \omega(1)$. Finally, for any two vertices $u \in U_0$ and $v \in V_{\geq w'} \cap B_0$, the probability that u and v are adjacent is $\Omega(1)$, since $w_0 w'/\nu \geq w_0^2/\nu = \omega(1)$ with room to spare. The claim now follows as for the other cases.

So we have shown that in all cases whp an $\Omega(1)$ fraction of all vertices in U_0 is active in round 2, so let us assume this. To show that $\mathcal{H}(0)$ holds whp, recall that any two vertices in U_0 have probability $\Omega(1)$ to be connected. Therefore, the probability that a vertex in U_0 does not become active in round 3 is at most $\Pr[\mathrm{Bin}\,(|U_0|, \Omega(1)) < k] = \exp[-\Omega(|U_0|)] = o(1/|U_0|)$ by a Chernoff bound. Hence, by the union bound whp all vertices in U_0 are active in round 3. This proves that $\mathcal{H}(0)$ holds whp.

It remains to prove that the statement holds uniformly for all $i \geq 1$. By (a) we may assume that for all $i \geq 0$ the set $|U_i|$ satisfies $|U_i| = \nu_i^{\Omega(\eta)}$ and $|U_i| = O(\nu_i)$.

We claim that any two vertices $v_{i-1} \in U_{i-1}$ and $v_i \in U_i$ with fixed position and weight form an edge with probability $\Omega(1)$. Indeed, this follows immediately since their distance is at most $(\nu_i/n)^{1/d}$, and hence

$$\frac{w_{v_{i-1}} w_{v_i}}{\|x_{v_i} - x_{v_{i-1}}\|^d n} \geq \frac{w_{i-1,0} w_{i,0}}{\nu_i} = \nu_i^{\frac{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-1}+1}{\beta-1+\eta}-1} = \nu_i^{\Omega(\varepsilon)-O(\eta)} = \omega(1).$$

Therefore, the number of edges from a vertex $v_i \in U_i$ into U_{i-1} is lower bounded by a binomially distributed random variable $\mathrm{Bin}\big(|U_{i-1}|, \Omega(1)\big)$. By the Chernoff bound, the probability that v_i has less than k neighbours in U_{i-1} is at most $\exp[-\Omega(|U_i|)] = \exp[-\nu_{i-1}^{\Omega(\eta)}]$. A union bound over all vertices in U_{i-1} shows that still with probability at least $1 - \exp[-\nu_{i-1}^{\Omega(\eta)}]$ every vertex in U_i has at least k neighbours in U_{i-1}. A union bound over all $i \geq 1$ shows that whp the same is still true for all $i \geq 1$ simultaneously. Hence, by a simple induction, all the events $\mathcal{H}(i)$ occur, as required.

(c) We only give the proof in the case $\alpha < \infty$, and explain in the end the changes that are necessary for $\alpha = \infty$. For $\alpha < \infty$, we prove the statement for

$C_0 := (8k)^{2d/(\varepsilon^2(\beta-2))}$, $C_1 := 4^{-d/\varepsilon}$ and $C_2 := [\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)/(\beta-1+\eta)$, where we assume that $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small. We use induction on ℓ. If $w_v \geq w_{i,0}$ then $\mathcal{H}(i)$ implies that $v \in A(i+3)$, so for $\ell = 0$ there is nothing to show. So let $\ell \geq 1$. Before we start with the inductive step, note that we may assume

$$\nu_i^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}} \geq C_0^{\beta-1+\eta} \geq (8k)^{2d(\beta-1+\eta)/(\varepsilon^2(\beta-2))}, \tag{24}$$

since otherwise both the statements for ℓ and $\ell-1$ concern only vertices of weight at least C_0, and thus the case ℓ follows trivially from the statement for $\ell-1$. Let v be a vertex with position $x_v \in B_i$ and with weight $w_v \geq w_{i,\ell}$. We claim that every vertex in distance at most $r_\ell := (\nu_i^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}}/n)^{1/d}$ with weight at least $w_{i,\ell-1}$ has probability $\Omega(1)$ to connect to v. Indeed, this follows from

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{w_{i,\ell-1}w_{i,\ell}}{r_\ell^d n} &= \nu_i^{[2-\beta-\eta+(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-1}](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)} \\ &\geq \nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)} \\ &\overset{(24)}{\geq} (8k)^{d/\varepsilon} \geq 1\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Since $\ell \geq 1$, we have $r_\ell \leq (\nu_i/n)^{1/d}$, which is the radius corresponding to the ball B_i. Hence, if we consider a ball around v with radius r_ℓ, then at least a 2^{-d} proportion of this ball falls into B_i. Therefore, the expected size of $N_{\ell-1}(v)$ satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell-1}(v)|] &= \Omega(1)2^{-d}r_\ell^d n w_{i,\ell-1}^{1-\beta+\eta}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)} \\ &\geq c2^{-d}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2+2\eta)](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)}\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c > 0$ and any sufficiently large n. Furthermore, if the constant $\varepsilon > 0$ is sufficiently small we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell-1}(v)|] \geq 2^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)} \overset{(24)}{\geq} (4k)^{d/\varepsilon} \geq 8k.$$

Recall that $|N_{\ell-1}(v)|$ is a Poisson distributed random variable and thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[|N_{\ell-1}(v)| < k] &\leq \exp(-\mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell-1}(v)|]/4) \cdot \exp(-\mathbb{E}[|N_{\ell-1}(v)|]/4) \\ &\leq \exp(-2k)\exp\left(-4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)}\right).\end{aligned}$$

So assume that $|N_{\ell-1}(v)| \geq k$, and pick any k vertices $v_1, \dots, v_k \in N_{\ell-1}(v)$. By induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[v_1 \notin A(i+\ell+1)] &\leq \exp\left[-4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+2}/(\beta-1+\eta)}\right] \\ &\overset{(24)}{\leq} \exp\left[-2\cdot 4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)}\right] \\ &\overset{(24)}{\leq} \exp(-k^d)\exp\left[-4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2](\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}/(\beta-1+\eta)}\right]\end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality holds since $\zeta-\varepsilon \geq 1+\varepsilon$ for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. The same bound applies to the other v_j. By a simple union bound,

$$\Pr[v_1, \dots, v_k \in A(i+\ell+1)] \geq 1 - k\exp(-k^d)\exp\left[-4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2]\frac{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}}{\beta-1+\eta}}\right].$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr[v \notin A(i+\ell+2)] &\le \Pr[|N_{\ell-1}(v)| < k] + \Pr[\{v_1,\dots,v_k\} \not\subseteq A(i+\ell+1)] \\ &\le \big(\exp(-2k) + k\exp(-k^d)\big)\exp\left[-4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2]\frac{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}}{\beta-1+\eta}}\right] \\ &\le \exp\left[-4^{-d/\varepsilon}\nu_i^{[\varepsilon(\beta-2)/2]\frac{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell+1}}{\beta-1+\eta}}\right] \\ &= \exp\left[-C_1\nu_i^{C_2(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}}\right]\end{aligned}$$

as required.

For $\alpha = \infty$, Equation (25) does not imply that the corresponding vertices connect with probability $\Omega(1)$, but it suffices to decrease r_ℓ by at most a constant factor to ensure this property. This can be compensated by changing (for example) C_1. We omit the details. □

7. Infection times: Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Let $v = (x_v, w_v)$ be an fixed vertex that satisfies the conditions in Theorem 4. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant and let $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$ be a constant which is sufficiently small compared to ε, cf. Section 2.3.

First we remark that it suffices to show that for every sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, whp $L_v = (1 \pm O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v, w_v) \pm O(1)$, where the hidden constants are both independent of ε. Then by a standard diagonalizing argument, we also have whp $L_v = (1 \pm o(1))\Lambda(x_v, w_v) \pm O(1)$. We split the proof in three parts (I), (II) and (III), "typical" vertices are treated in (III):

(I): Assume that $w_v > (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)}$ and the maximum in (4) is 0, i.e. we also have $w_v \ge \|x_v\|^d n/\nu$. In this case, the lower bound on L_v is trivial, so we show the upper bound. Since then the second term in the maximum must be non-positive, we have $\|x_v\|^d n \le w_v\nu$. Let $i \ge 1$ be so large that $(\zeta-\varepsilon)^i/(\beta-1+\eta) > 1$, but observe that we may still choose $i = O(1)$.

Assume first $\|x_v\|^d n \le \nu_i$, so $x_v \in B_i$. By the technical condition in Theorem 4 we have $\|x_v\|^d n \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0$, and hence $w_v \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0^{1/(\beta-1)} = \nu^{\Omega(1)} = \nu_i^{\Omega(1)}$. Hence, we may choose $\ell = O(1)$ such that $w_v \ge w_{i,\ell} = \nu_i^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1+\eta)}$, and it follows directly from part (c) of Theorem 19 that whp v is active after $i+\ell+3 = O(1)$ rounds, as required.

On the other hand, if $\|x_v\|^d n \ge \nu_i$ then every vertex in B_i has distance at most $3\|x_v\|^d n$ from v. Let $w_i := \nu_i^{1/(\beta-1+\eta)}$. By Theorem 19, after $i+3$ rounds all vertices in $V_{\ge w_i} \cap B_i$ are active whp, and there are $\nu_i^{\Omega(\eta)} = \omega(1)$ many such vertices. Note that any such vertex has probability $\Omega(1)$ to form an edge with v, since $w_v w_i/(3^d\|x_v\|^d n) \ge w_i/(3^d\nu) = \Omega(1)$. Therefore, whp v is active in round $i+4 = O(1)$, again as required.

(II): Assume that still $w_v > (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)}$, but that the maximum in (4) is attained by the second term, i.e. $\|x_v\|^d n/w_v \ge \nu$. We need to show an upper and a lower bound on L_v. For the upper bound, choose $i \ge 0$ minimal such that

$$\|x_v\|^d n/w_v \le w_i, \tag{26}$$

where $w_i = \nu_i^{1/(\beta-1+\eta)} = \nu^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^i/(\beta-1+\eta)}$ as before. Observe that this i satisfies

$$i = \log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n/w_v)/\log(\zeta-\varepsilon) + O(1) \le (1+O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v,w_v) + O(1).$$

By Theorem 19, whp all vertices in $V_{\ge w_i} \cap B_i$ are active in round $i+3$, and there are $\omega(1)$ of them. As in (I), we discriminate two sub-cases.

Either $\|x_v\|^d n \ge \nu_i$. In this case, the distance from v to any point in B_i is at most $3\|x_v\|$, and v has probability $\Omega(1)$ to form an edge with each vertex in $V_{\ge w_i} \cap B_i$ by (26). By Theorem 19, whp all these vertices are active in round $i+3$, and there are $\omega(1)$ of them, so whp v will be active in round $i+4$.

Or $\|x_v\|^d n \le \nu_i$, hence $x_v \in B_i$. Furthermore we have $w_v > (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)} \ge (w_{i-1}w_v)^{1/(\beta-1)}$ by minimality of i in (26), implying $w_v > w_{i-1}^{1/(\beta-2)} \ge w_i$. Thus by Theorem 19 whp v is active in round $i+3$. In either case, whp v is active in round $i+O(1)$, i.e. $L_v \le i + O(1) \le (1+O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v,w_v) + O(1)$, as required.

For the lower bound, if $\|x_v\|^d n/w_v \le \widetilde{\nu}_0 = \nu^{(\beta-1)/(\beta-2)+\varepsilon}$ then $\Lambda(x_v,w_v) = O(1)$, so there is nothing to show.

Otherwise, $\|x_v\|^d n/w_v \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0 \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0^{1/(\beta-1-\eta)}$, so we may choose $i \ge 0$ to be maximal such that

$$\|x_v\|^d n/w_v \ge \tilde{w}_i, \tag{27}$$

where $\tilde{w}_i = \widetilde{\nu}_i^{1/(\beta-1-\eta)} = \widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^i/(\beta-1-\eta)}$ as before. Note that this i satisfies

$$i = \log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n/w_v)/\log(\zeta+\varepsilon) - O(1) \ge (1-O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v,w_v) - O(1).$$

Let $\ell = O(1)$ be sufficiently large such that $\zeta^\ell > (\beta-1-\eta)$. If $i \le \ell$, then $i = O(1)$, and there is nothing to show. Otherwise, (27) implies in particular

$$\|x_v\|^d n \ge \Omega(1)\widetilde{\nu}_i^{1/(\beta-1-\eta)} = \Omega(1)\widetilde{\nu}_{i-\ell}^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^\ell/(\beta-1-\eta)} > 2\widetilde{\nu}_{i-\ell}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 14 (with $C = 2^{1/d} > 1$) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[N(v) \cap \widetilde{B}_{i-\ell}] = O(1)\widetilde{\nu}_{i-\ell}\left(\|x_v\|^d n/w_v\right)^{1-\beta+\eta}.$$

Using (27), we may continue

$$\mathbb{E}[N(v) \cap \widetilde{B}_{i-\ell}] = O(1)\widetilde{\nu}_{i-\ell}/\widetilde{\nu}_i = \widetilde{\nu}_i^{-\Omega(1)},$$

where the last step holds for any $\ell \ge 1$. By Markov's inequality, whp v has no neighbours in $\widetilde{B}_{i-\ell}$. On the other hand, by Theorem 17 whp there is no active vertex outside of $\widetilde{B}_{i-\ell}$ in round $i-\ell$. Therefore, whp v is not active in round $i-\ell+1$, i.e. $L_v > i-\ell+1 \ge (1-O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v,w_v) - O(1)$, as required.

(III): Assume $w_v \le (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)}$. Again we need to show an upper and a lower bound for L_v. For the *upper bound*, let $i \ge 0$ be minimal with the property that $x_v \in B_i$, i.e.

$$\|x_v\|^d n \le \nu_i = \nu^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^i} \tag{28}$$

Observe that $i \ge 1$ because $\|x_v\|^d n \ge \widetilde{\nu}_0 > \nu$ due to the technical assumption in Theorem 4 and since the function Λ is non-negative. Thus, we have $\|x_v\|^d n \ge \nu_{i-1} = \nu_i^{1/(\zeta-\varepsilon)}$ by minimality of i. Let $\ell \ge 0$ be minimal with the property that

$$w_v > (\|x_v\|^d n)^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell}/(\beta-1+\eta)} \tag{29}$$

Since we are in the case $w_v \le (\|x_v\|^d n)^{1/(\beta-1)}$, we have $\ell \ge 1$, and thus (29) is false if we replace ℓ by $\ell-1$. By minimality of i, the right hand side of (29) is at least $\nu_i^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}/(\beta-1+\eta)}$ and recall that we only consider weights $w_v = \omega(1)$. Hence,

Theorem 19 applies for $\ell+1$, and, if we condition on events that hold whp, tells us that v is active in round $i+\ell+4$ with probability

$$1-\exp\left[-C_1\nu_i^{C_2(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}}\right]=1-o(1),$$

where the last inequality holds due to the following estimate

$$\nu_i^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}}\overset{(28)}{\geq}(\|x_v\|^d n)^{(\zeta-\varepsilon)^{-\ell-1}}\overset{(29),\ell-1}{\geq}w_v^{(\beta-1+\eta)/(\zeta-\varepsilon)^2}=\omega(1).$$

It remains to note that by choice of i and ℓ we have

$$i=\log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n)/\log(\zeta-\varepsilon)+O(1)$$

and $\ell=i+\log\log_\nu w_v/\log(\zeta-\varepsilon)+O(1)$. Hence, whp $L_v\leq i+\ell+4\leq(1+O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v,w_v)+O(1)$, as required.

For the *lower bound*, we distinguish yet two more sub-cases. Let $\ell\geq 0$ be the smallest non-negative integer that satisfies

$$w_v^2\geq 2^{-(\ell+1)d}(\|x_v\|^d n)^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-3}/(\beta-1)}. \tag{30}$$

(IIIa) Assume first that $\|x_v\|^d n\geq 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0$. In this case, let $i\geq 1$ be maximal with the property

$$\|x_v\|^d n\geq 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_{i-1}=2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{i-1}}. \tag{31}$$

It is easy to check (e.g., by using the very generous estimate $2<\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^i}$) that i satisfies

$$i\geq\log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n)/\log(\zeta+\varepsilon)-O(\log(\ell+1)). \tag{32}$$

If $\ell=O(1)$ then $w_v=(\|x_v\|^d n)^{\Theta(1)}$ and therefore

$$\Lambda(x_v,w_v)=\log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n)/|\log(\beta-2)|\pm O(1).$$

Since by Theorem 17 (c) whp no vertex outside of $\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$ is active in round $i-1$ and $x_v\notin\widetilde{B}_{i-1}$, we have whp $L_v>i-1\geq(1-O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v,w_v)-O(1)$, as required.

Next observe that there exists $0\leq j\leq O(\log(\ell+1))$ such that $\|x_v\|^d n\leq\widetilde{\nu}_{i+j}$. In particular, if $\ell>C$ for some sufficiently large constant $C>0$ then $j<\ell$. Since we have already treated the case $\ell=O(1)$, we may henceforth assume that $\ell>C$. Then $\ell-j>0$, and by (31) the requirements of Theorem 17 (f) are met for i and $\ell-j$. By minimality of ℓ,

$$\begin{aligned}w_v^2&\leq 2^{-\ell d}(\|x_v\|^d n)^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)}\leq 2^{-\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_{i+j}^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)}\\&=2^{-\ell d}\widetilde{\nu}_i^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-(\ell-j)-2}/(\beta-1)},\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

and therefore Theorem 17 (f) yields that v is not active in round $i+\ell-j$ with probability at least

$$1-w_v 2^{(\ell-j)d}\widetilde{\nu}_i^{-(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-(\ell-j)-2}/(\beta-1)}\overset{(33)}{\geq}1-w_v^{-1}2^{-jd}=1-o(1).$$

In order to relate $i+\ell-j$ with $\Lambda(x_v,w_v)$, we derive $\|x_v\|^d n\geq\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{i-1}}$ from (31), and plug it into (30) to obtain

$$w_v^2\geq 2^{-(\ell+1)d}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{i-\ell-4}/(\beta-1)}=2^{-(\ell+1)d}\nu^{\Theta(1)(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{i-\ell}}.$$

Hence, taking logarithms on both sides,

$$\Theta(1)(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{i-\ell}\log\nu\leq 2\log w_v+(\ell+1)d\log 2\leq O(\max\{\log w_v,\ell\}). \tag{34}$$

If the maximum is attained by $\log w_v$, then (34) gives $\ell \geq i - \log\log_\nu w_v / \log(\zeta + \varepsilon) - O(1)$, and together with (32) and $j = O(\log(1+\ell))$, we conclude $i + \ell - j \geq (1-O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v, w_v) - O(1)$, as required. On the other hand, of the maximum in (34) is attained by ℓ, then (34) yields

$$\ell + O(\log \ell) \geq i + \frac{\log\log\nu}{\log(\zeta+\varepsilon)} - O(1) \geq i - \frac{\log\log_\nu w_v}{\log(\zeta+\varepsilon)} - O(1),$$

where the second inequality comes from $w_v = \omega(1)$. Thus we obtain again $i+\ell-j \geq (1-O(\varepsilon))\Lambda(x_v, w_v) - O(1)$, as required. This concludes the proof of the lower bound in the case $\|x_v\|^d n \geq 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0$.

(IIIb) Assume $\|x_v\|^d n \leq 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0$. It remains to show the lower bound on L_v in this case. We want to apply Theorem 17 (f) for $i = 0$, but we need to change the definition of ℓ slightly. Let $\ell' \geq 0$ be minimal with the property

$$w_v^2 \geq 2^{-(\ell'+1)d}\widetilde{\nu}_0^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell'-3}/(\beta-1)}. \tag{35}$$

Similar as before, this definition implies $\ell' + O(\log(\ell'+1)) \geq -\log\log_\nu w_v / \log(\zeta+\varepsilon) - O(1)$. If $\ell' \leq 1$ then $w_v = \widetilde{\nu}_0^{\Omega(1)}$. In this case, since $\|x_v\|^d n \leq 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0$, a sufficient condition for ℓ to satisfy (30) is

$$\widetilde{\nu}_0^{\Omega(1)} \geq 2^{-(\ell+1)d}(2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0)^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-3}/(\beta-1)},$$

which is already satisfied for $\ell = O(1)$. Since ℓ was chosen minimally, this implies $\ell = O(1)$ and thus $\|x_v\|^d n = \widetilde{\nu}_0^{O(1)}$, and the lower bound is trivial. So assume instead that $\ell' > 1$. Let $\ell^* := \min\{\ell' - 1, \Lambda(x_v, w_v)\}$. Then by the assumption in Theorem 4, we have $\ell^* \leq \log_2(\|x_v\|^d n/\widetilde{\nu}_0)$, and hence $\|x_v\|^d n \geq 2^{\ell^*}\widetilde{\nu}_0$. Since $\ell^* < \ell'$, the reverse of (35) holds. These two properties allow us to apply Theorem 17 (f) with $i = 0$ and $\ell^* - 1$, which tells us that v is not active in round $\ell^* - 1$ with probability at least $1 - w_v^{-1} = 1 - o(1)$. It remains to relate ℓ^* with $\Lambda(x_v, w_v)$. To this end, all that remains to be shown is that $\log\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n) = o(\ell') + O(1)$. Since $\|x_v\|^d n \leq 2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0$, we have $\log_\nu(\|x_v\|^d n) \leq o(\ell) + O(1)$. However, by minimality of ℓ, we have

$$w_v^2 \leq 2^{-\ell d}(\|x_v\|^d n)^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1-\eta)} \leq (2^{\ell+1}\widetilde{\nu}_0)^{(\zeta+\varepsilon)^{-\ell-2}/(\beta-1)},$$

and similar as for (31) it can be easily deduced that $\ell = O(\log\log_\nu w_v) = O(\ell')$. This concludes the proof for the case $\|x_v\|^d n \leq 2^\ell \widetilde{\nu}_0$. □

8. Threshold and speed of the process: Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

We prove Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 together. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a constant and let $\eta = \eta(\varepsilon) > 0$ be a constant which is sufficiently small compared to ε, cf. Section 2.3.

We first show the second statement of Theorem 2.

Claim 21. *Assume that* $\alpha > \beta - 1$ *and* $\nu = n^{o(1)}$*, then* $|V^{\leq(1-\varepsilon)i_\infty}| = o(n)$ *whp.*

Proof. Let i_0 be (somewhat arbitrary) the largest integer such that $\widetilde{\nu}_{i_0-1} \leq n/\log^2 n$ and note that then $i_0 \geq (1 - O(\varepsilon))(\log\log_\nu n)/|\log(\beta-2)|$. Moreover, for $i_1 := (1-\varepsilon)(\log\log n)/|\log(\beta-2)|$ we have $2^{i_1}\widetilde{\nu}_{i_0-1} = o(n)$, so whp there are $o(n)$ vertices in $2^{i_1}\widetilde{B}_{i_0-1}$. Next consider the vertices outside of $2^{i_1}\widetilde{B}_{i_0-1}$. By Theorem 17 each such vertex of weight at most $\log\log n$ has probability $o(1)$ to be in $V^{\leq i_0+i_1}$. Therefore, the expected number of vertices of weight at most $\log\log n$ in $V^{\leq i_0+i_1}$

is $o(n)$. On the other hand, the total expected number of vertices of weight larger than $\log\log n$ is also $o(n)$. Altogether, this shows $\mathbb{E}[|V^{\leq i_0+i_1}|] = o(n)$, and the statement follows from Markov's inequality. □

Subcritical regime: (iii), (v). We will indeed show that whp the process does not infect any vertices in the first step.

Claim 22. *$V^{\leq 1} = V^{\leq 0}$ whp.*

Proof. For any vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ with fixed weight and position we denote by $\mu_v := \mathbb{E}[|N(v) \cap B_0|]$ its expected number of neighbours in B_0. We have shown in Lemma 14 that for any constant $C > 1$,

$$\mu_v = O(\nu) \cdot \begin{cases} \min\{w_v/\nu, 1\}, & \text{if } \|x_v\| \leq C(\nu/n)^{1/d}/2, \\ \min\left\{\left(w_v/(\|x_v\|^d n)\right)^m, 1\right\} & \text{if } \|x_v\| \geq C(\nu/n)^{1/d}/2, \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

where $m = \min\{\alpha, \beta - 1 - \eta\} > 1$. Since initially only vertices in B_0 are activated, recall that the number $N^{\leq 0}(v)$ of *initially active* neighbours of v is Poisson distributed with mean $\rho\mu_v$. In particular, $\Pr[|N^{\leq 0}(v)| \geq k] = \Pr[\mathrm{Po}(\rho\mu_v) \geq k] = O(1)\min\{(\rho\mu_v)^k, 1\}$. Clearly, we can bound the number $|V^{=1}|$ of vertices that turn active in round 1 by the number of vertices that have at least k neighbours in $V^{\leq 0}$. (It is only an upper bound since the latter also counts vertices which were already in $V^{\leq 0}$.)

So let us first consider the contribution $n_{\text{in}} := |V^{=1} \cap 2B_0|$ of vertices $v = (x_v, w_v)$ inside of $2B_0$. By (36) these satisfy $\mu_v = O(w_v)$, and thus by Lemma 10 and 11 we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[n_{\text{in}}] = O(1)\int_0^\infty \nu w^{1-\beta+\gamma}\frac{d}{dw}\min\{(\rho w)^k, 1\}dw = O(\nu\rho^{\beta-1-\gamma}) = o(1), \tag{37}$$

where $\gamma = 0$ in case of a strong power-law, and otherwise γ is an arbitrary positive constant.

On the other hand, to estimate the contribution $n_{\text{out}} := |V^{=1} \cap (\mathbb{T}^d \setminus 2B_0)|$ of vertices $v = (x_v, w_v)$ outside of $2B_0$, we may use $\mu_v = O(\nu)(w_v/(\|x_v\|^d n))^m$ by (36). Furthermore, since each such vertex has distance at least $(\nu/n)^{1/d}$ from the origin, Lemma 10 and Lemma 11 imply

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[n_{\text{out}}] &= O(1)\int_{(\nu/n)^{1/d}}^\infty r^{d-1}n\int_0^\infty w^{1-\beta+\eta}\frac{d}{dw}\min\left\{\left(\rho\nu\left(\frac{w}{r^d n}\right)^m\right)^k, 1\right\}dwdr \\ &= O(1)\int_{(\nu/n)^{1/d}}^\infty r^{d-1}n\left(\frac{r^d n}{(\rho\nu)^{1/m}}\right)^{1-\beta+\eta}dr \\ &= O(1)\nu^{2-\beta+\eta}(\rho\nu)^{(\beta-1+\eta)/m} \end{aligned}$$

Now we use that $\rho = O(\nu^{-1/(\beta-1)})$. Observe that this bound holds both in case (iii) and (v), and that it even holds for the critical case (ii). We derive $\rho\nu = O(\nu^{(\beta-2)/(\beta-1)})$, and hence $\mathbb{E}[n_{\text{out}}] = \nu^{-(\beta-2)(1-1/m)+O(\eta)}$. Thus, since $m > 1$, if $\eta > 0$ is small enough we have

$$\mathbb{E}[n_{\text{out}}] = o(1). \tag{38}$$

We will later use the fact that this also holds in the critical regime (ii).

Together (37) and (38) show that $\mathbb{E}[|V^{=1}|] = o(1)$, and thus by Markov's inequality whp no vertices turned active in round 1, as claimed. □

Critical regime: (ii). We first show that with constant probability no further vertices are ever activated.

Claim 23. *$V^{\leq 1} = V^{\leq 0}$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

Proof. First observe that (38) also holds in this regime, i.e. by Markov's inequality whp no vertex outside of $2B_0$ is active in round 1. Furthermore, let $\xi > 0$ be a (small) constant, to be determined later, and let $w_0 := \nu^{1/(\beta-1)}$. Moreover, note that $|V_{\geq \xi w_0} \cap 2B_0|$ is Poisson distributed with mean $O(\nu(\xi w_0)^{1-\beta}) = O(1)$, since $\xi = \Omega(1)$. Therefore the event $\mathcal{A} := \{V_{\geq \xi w_0} \cap 2B_0 = \emptyset\}$ occurs with probability at least $\exp[-O(1)] = \Omega(1)$. Consequently it suffices to show that $V^{\leq 1}_{\leq \xi w_0} \cap 2B_0 = V^{\leq 0}$ with probability $\Omega(1)$ if we condition on the event $\mathcal{A}$.

Since every vertex $v = (x_v, w_v)$ satisfies $\mathbb{E}[|N(v) \cap B_0|] \leq \mathbb{E}[|N(v)|] = O(w_v)$, by (11), the number of neighbours in $V^{\leq 0}$ is a Poisson distributed random variable with mean at most $O(\rho w_v)$. Observe that this upper bound remains valid if we condition on the event $\mathcal{A}$, since this can only decrease the expected degree of v. Therefore we obtain

$$\Pr\left[|N^{\leq 0}(v)| \geq k \;\middle|\; \mathcal{A}\right] = O(1)\min\{(\rho w_v)^k, 1\} = O((\rho w_v)^k),$$

and by Lemma 10 it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[|V^{=1}_{\leq \xi w_0} \cap 2B_0| \;\middle|\; \mathcal{A}\right] &= O\left(\nu(\xi w_0)^{1-\beta}(\rho \xi w_0)^k + \int_0^{\xi w_0} \nu w^{1-\beta} \frac{d}{dw}(\rho w)^k dw\right) \\ &= O(1)\nu(\xi w_0)^{1-\beta}(\rho \xi w_0)^k = O(\xi^{k+1-\beta}),\end{aligned}$$

where all the hidden constants are independent of ξ. Now note that we may choose $\xi > 0$ small enough such that $\mathbb{E}\left[|V^{=1}_{\leq \xi w_0} \cap 2B_0| \;\middle|\; \mathcal{A}\right] \leq 1/2$, and then by Markov's inequality $|V^{=1}_{\leq \xi w_0} \cap 2B_0| = 0$ with conditional probability at least $1/2$. Thus $V^{\leq 1} = V^{\leq 0}$ with probability $\Omega(1)$, and the claim follows. □

Next we show that with constant probability at least k heavy vertices will be activated in the first round. Afterwards, the remaining steps will be identical with the supercritical regime, so we prove them together, cf. below.

Claim 24. *$|V^{=1}_{\geq w_0} \cap B_0| \geq k$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.*

Proof. We first consider the case $\alpha < \infty$. Note that the number of vertices in B_0 of weight at least $w_0 = \nu^{1/(\beta-1)}$ is Poisson distributed with mean $\Theta(\nu w_0^{\beta-1}) = \Theta(1)$. In particular, with probability $\Omega(1)$ there are at least k such vertices. So assume this event holds, and let $v_1, \dots, v_k$ be k distinct such vertices. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$, denote by K_i be the intersection of B_0 with the ball of volume $\nu^{1/(\beta-1)}/n$ around v_i. Note that $n\mathrm{Vol}(K_i) = \Omega(\nu^{1/(\beta-1)})$. The number of vertices in $V^{\leq 0} \cap K_i$ is Poisson distributed with mean $\rho n \mathrm{Vol}(K_i)$, so in particular $\Pr[|V^{\leq 0} \cap K_i| \geq k] = \Omega(1)$. Note that the events $\mathcal{K}(i) := \{|V^{\leq 0} \cap K_i| \geq k\}$ are positively associated for different i, i.e, conditioning on the events $\mathcal{K}(i_1), \dots, \mathcal{K}(i_s)$ does not decrease the probability of $\mathcal{K}(i)$ for any subset of (distinct) indices $i_1, \dots, i_s, i$. Hence,

$$\Pr[\forall i \in \{1, \dots k\} : \mathcal{K}(i)] \geq \prod_{i=1}^{k} \Pr[\mathcal{K}(i)] = \Omega(1)$$

by the law of conditional probability.

On the other hand, for each vertex v with fixed weight and fixed position in K_i we have $\Pr[\{v, v_i\} \in E] = \Omega(w_0/\nu^{1/(\beta-1)}) = \Omega(1)$, and this lower bound is independent for any two such vertices. So conditioned on the events $\mathcal{K}(i)$, we have $\Pr[v_i \in V^{\leq 1} \mid \mathcal{K}(1), \dots, \mathcal{K}(k)] = \Omega(1)$, and this lower bound is independent for all i. Altogether, we have shown that with probability $\Omega(1)$ we have $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\} \subseteq V^{=1}_{\geq w_0} \cap B_0$, proving the claim in the case of $\alpha > \infty$.

The case $\alpha = \infty$ is completely analogous, except that it may be necessary to shrink the balls around $v_1, \dots, v_k$ be at most a constant factor, so that still every vertex in the i-th ball has probability $\Omega(1)$ to connect to v_i. Since this only decreases the expected number of (active) vertices in each ball by constant factors, the remaining proof stays the same. We omit the details. □

Supercritical regime: (i), (iv). In this proof we also include the critical regime (ii), provided that at least k heavy vertices got activated in the first round, i.e. $|V^{=1}_{\geq w_0} \cap B_0| \geq k$, where as before $w_0 = \nu^{1/(\beta-1)}$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be constant.

Claim 25. $\mathbb{E}[|V^{\leq (1+\varepsilon) i_\infty}|] = \Omega(n)$.

Proof. Let $i \geq 0$ be the smallest index such that $\nu_i \geq n$ (and thus $B_i = \mathbb{T}^d$), and note that $i \leq (1+\varepsilon)(\log\log_\nu n)/|\log(\beta-2)|$ if n is sufficiently large. Then there exists $\ell \leq (1+\varepsilon)(\log\log n)/|\log(\beta-2)|$ such that $w_{i,\ell} = O(1)$. Theorem 19 tells us immediately that every vertex of weight at least C has probability $\Omega(1)$ to be in $A(i+3+\ell)$, for some sufficiently large constant $C > 0$. Since the expected number of vertices of weight at least C is $\Omega(n)$, this already shows the claim. □

It remains to proof the corresponding whp statement.

Claim 26. $|V^{\leq (1+\varepsilon) i_\infty}| = \Omega(n)$ *whp.*

Proof. Let $h = h(n) = \omega(1)$ be a function with $\log\log h = o(\log\log n)$. Then by the same argument as before, every vertex of weight at least $w_h := \hat{w}_-(h) = h^{1/(\beta-1+\eta)}$ has probability $1 - h^{-\Omega(1)}$ to be in $V^{\leq (1+\varepsilon/2) i_\infty}$. Now decompose the torus $\mathbb{T}^d$ into balls $Q_1, \dots, Q_s$ of volume $\Theta(h/n)$.[4] Fix any such ball Q, and call Q *good* if in round $j := (1+\varepsilon/2) i_\infty$ at least half of the vertices in $V_{\geq w_h} \cap Q$ are active, and *bad* otherwise. Recall that in expectation only a $o(1)$ fraction of the vertices in $V_{\geq w_h} \cap Q$ are inactive in round j, so by Markov's inequality the probability that Q is bad is $o(1)$. So in expectation only a $o(1)$ fraction of the sets $Q_1, \dots, Q_s$ are bad, and again by Markov's inequality, whp at least half of them are good.

Now let $C > 0$ be a sufficiently large constant, and assume Q is good. Then we may apply Remark 20 (for some suitably chosen $0 \leq \ell = O(\log\log h)$) to deduce that an expected 2/3-fraction of the vertices in $V_{\geq C} \cap Q$ are active in round $j + \ell$, if $C > 0$ is sufficiently large. In formula, $\mathbb{E}[|V^{\leq j+\ell}_{\geq C} \cap Q|] \geq 2\mathbb{E}[|V_{\geq C} \cap Q|]/3$, and thus by Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr\left[\left|V^{\leq j+\ell}_{\geq C} \cap Q\right| \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{\geq C} \cap Q\right|\right]/2\right] = \Omega(1),$$

and this bound holds independently of the activity in any other ball. Therefore, by a Chernoff bound, whp an $\Omega(1)$ fraction of the balls $Q_1, \dots, Q_s$ satisfy $|V^{\leq j+\ell}_{\geq C} \cap Q| \geq \mathbb{E}\left[\left|V_{\geq C} \cap Q\right|\right]/2 = \Omega(h)$, and thus whp $|V^{\leq j+\ell}| = \Omega(s \cdot h) = \Omega(n)$. Since $j + \ell \leq (1+\varepsilon) i_\infty$ for sufficiently large n, the claim follows. □

[4] This is possible since we use the ∞-norm. It would also suffice to consider any disjoint balls with total volume $\Omega(1)$.

Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

Proof. Theorem 1 follows from Claims 22, 23, 24 and 26, while Theorem 2 is proven by Claims 21 and 26. □

9. Concluding remarks

We have shown that in the GIRG model for scale-free networks with underlying geometry, even a small region can cause an infection that spreads through a linear part of the population. We have analysed the process in great detail, and we have determined its metastability threshold, its speed, and the time at which individual vertices become active. Moreover, we have shown how a policy-maker can utilize this knowledge to enforce a successful quarantine strategy. We want to emphasize that the latter result is only a proof of concept, intended to illustrate the possibilities that come from a thorough understanding of the role of the underlying geometry in infection processes. In particular, we want to remind the reader that bootstrap percolation is not a perfect model for viral infections (though it has been used to this end), but is more adequate for processes in which the probability of transmission grows more than proportional if more than one neighbours is active, like believes spreading through a social network ("What I tell you three times is true."), or action potential spreading through a neuronal network.

Therefore, this paper is only a first step. There are many other models for the spreading of activity, most notably SIR and SIRS models for epidemiological applications, and we have much yet to learn from analysing these models in geometric power-law networks like GIRGs. From a technical point of view, it is unsatisfactory that our analysis does not include the case $\alpha \leq \beta - 1$. We believe that also in this case, the bootstrap percolation process is essentially governed by the geometry of the underlying space, only in a more complex way. Understanding this case would probably also add to our toolbox for analysing less "clear-cut" processes.

References

1. Joan Adler and Uri Lev, *Bootstrap percolation: visualizations and applications*, Brazilian Journal of Physics **33** (2003), no. 3, 641–644.
2. William Aiello, Anthony Bonato, Colin Cooper, Jeanette Janssen, and Paweł Prałat, *A spatial web graph model with local influence regions*, Internet Mathematics **5** (2008), no. 1-2, 175–196.
3. Michael Aizenman and Joel Lebowitz, *Metastability effects in bootstrap percolation*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General **21** (1988), no. 19, 3801.
4. Réka Albert and Albert-László Barabási, *Statistical mechanics of complex networks*, Reviews of modern physics **74** (2002), no. 1, 47.
5. Hamed Amini, *Bootstrap percolation in living neural networks*, Journal of Statistical Physics **141** (2010), no. 3, 459–475.
6. Hamed Amini, Rama Cont, and Andreea Minca, *Resilience to contagion in financial networks*, Mathematical finance (2013).
7. Hamed Amini and Nikolaos Fountoulakis, *Bootstrap percolation in power-law random graphs*, Journal of Statistical Physics **155** (2014), no. 1, 72–92.
8. József Balogh, Béla Bollobás, Hugo Duminil-Copin, and Robert Morris, *The sharp threshold for bootstrap percolation in all dimensions*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society **364** (2012), no. 5, 2667–2701.
9. József Balogh, Yuval Peres, and Gábor Pete, *Bootstrap percolation on infinite trees and non-amenable groups*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing **15** (2006), no. 05, 715–730.
10. Albert-László Barabási, *Network science: Luck or reason*, Nature **489** (2012), no. 7417, 507–508.

11. Gareth Baxter, Sergey Dorogovtsev, Alexander Goltsev, and José Mendes, *Bootstrap percolation on complex networks*, Physical Review E **82** (2010), no. 1, 011103.
12. Marián Boguñá, Dmitri Krioukov, and Kimberly Claffy, *Navigability of complex networks*, Nature Physics **5** (2009), no. 1, 74–80.
13. Marián Boguñá, Fragkiskos Papadopoulos, and Dmitri Krioukov, *Sustaining the internet with hyperbolic mapping*, Nature communications **1** (2010), 62.
14. Milan Bradonjić and Iraj Saniee, *Bootstrap percolation on random geometric graphs*, Probability in the Engineering and Informational Sciences **28** (2014), no. 02, 169–181.
15. Karl Bringmann, Ralph Keusch, and Johannes Lengler, *Geometric inhomogeneous random graphs*, arxiv (2015).
16. ———, *Average distance in a general class of scale-free graphs with underlying geometry*, arxiv (2016).
17. Elisabetta Candellero and Nikolaos Fountoulakis, *Bootstrap percolation and the geometry of complex networks*, arXiv:1412.1301 (2014).
18. Shai Carmi, Shlomo Havlin, Scott Kirkpatrick, Yuval Shavitt, and Eran Shir, *A model of internet topology using k-shell decomposition*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **104** (2007), no. 27, 11150–11154.
19. Damon Centola, *The spread of behavior in an online social network experiment*, Science **329** (2010), no. 5996, 1194–1197.
20. John Chalupa, Paul Leath, and Gary Reich, *Bootstrap percolation on a bethe lattice*, Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics **12** (1979), no. 1, L31–L35.
21. Or Cohen, Anna Keselman, Elisha Moses, Rodríguez Martínez, Jordi Soriano, and Tsvi Tlusty, *Quorum percolation in living neural networks*, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **89** (2010), no. 1, 18008.
22. Colin Cooper, Alan Frieze, and Paweł Prałat, *Algorithms and models for the web graph: 9th international workshop, waw 2012, halifax, ns, canada, june 22-23, 2012. proceedings*, ch. Some Typical Properties of the Spatial Preferred Attachment Model, pp. 29–40, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2012.
23. Sergey Dorogovtsev, Alexander Goltsev, and José Mendes, *K-core organization of complex networks*, Physical review letters **96** (2006), no. 4, 040601.
24. Sergey Dorogovtsev and José Mendes, *Evolution of networks*, Advances in Physics **51** (2002), no. 4, 1079–1187.
25. Paul Dreyer and Fred Roberts, *Irreversible k-threshold processes: Graph-theoretical threshold models of the spread of disease and of opinion*, Discrete Applied Mathematics **157** (2009), no. 7, 1615–1627.
26. Hafsteinn Einarsson, Johannes Lengler, Konstantinos Panagiotou, Frank Mousset, and Angelika Steger, *Bootstrap percolation with inhibition*, arXiv:1410.3291 (2014).
27. Hafsteinn Einarsson, Johannes Lengler, and Angelika Steger, *A high-capacity model for one shot association learning in the brain*, Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience **8** (2014), no. 140.
28. Paola Flocchini, Elena Lodi, Fabrizio Luccio, Linda Pagli, and Nicola Santoro, *Dynamic monopolies in tori*, Discrete applied mathematics **137** (2004), no. 2, 197–212.
29. Jian Gao, Tao Zhou, and Yanqing Hu, *Bootstrap percolation on spatial networks*, Scientific Reports **5** (2015), 14662.
30. Allen Gersho and Debasis Mitra, *A simple growth model for the diffusion of a new communication service*, Systems, Man and Cybernetics, IEEE Transactions on **SMC-5** (1975), no. 2, 209–216.
31. Mark Granovetter, *Threshold models of collective behavior*, American Journal of Sociology **83** (1978), no. 6, 1420–1443.
32. Mark S. Granovetter, *The strength of weak ties*, American Journal of Sociology **78** (1973), no. 6, 1360–1380.
33. Randi Griffin and Charles Nunn, *Community structure and the spread of infectious disease in primate social networks*, Evolutionary Ecology **26** (2012), no. 4, 779–800.
34. Wei Huang and Chunguang Li, *Epidemic spreading in scale-free networks with community structure*, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2007** (2007), no. 01, P01014.
35. Emmanuel Jacob and Peter Mörters, *Spatial preferential attachment networks: Power laws and clustering coefficients*, The Annals of Applied Probability **25** (2015), no. 2, 632–662.

36. Svante Janson, Tomasz Łuczak, Tatyana Turova, and Thomas Vallier, *Bootstrap percolation on the random graph $G(n,p)$*, The Annals of Applied Probability **22** (2012), no. 5, 1989–2047.
37. Jeannette Janssen and Abbas Mehrabian, *Algorithms and models for the web graph: 12th international workshop, waw 2015, eindhoven, the netherlands, december 10-11, 2015, proceedings*, ch. Rumours Spread Slowly in a Small World Spatial Network, pp. 107–118, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2015.
38. Amin Karbasi, Johannes Lengler, and Angelika Steger, *Automata, languages, and programming: 42nd international colloquium, icalp 2015, kyoto, japan, july 6-10, 2015, proceedings, part ii*, ch. Normalization Phenomena in Asynchronous Networks, pp. 688–700, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2015.
39. Scott Kirkpatrick, Winfried Wilcke, Robert Garner, and Harald Huels, *Percolation in dense storage arrays*, Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications **314** (2002), no. 1, 220–229.
40. Robert Kozma, *Neuropercolation*, Scholarpedia **2** (2007), no. 8, 1360.
41. Renaud Lambiotte and Pietro Panzarasa, *Communities, knowledge creation, and information diffusion*, Journal of Informetrics **3** (2009), no. 3, 180–190.
42. Cristian Moukarzel and Thomas Sokolowski, *Long-range k-core percolation*, Journal of Physics: Conference Series **246** (2010), no. 1, 012019.
43. Javier Orlandi, Jordi Soriano, Enrique Alvarez-Lacalle, Sara Teller, and Jaume Casademunt, *Noise focusing and the emergence of coherent activity in neuronal cultures*, Nature Physics **9** (2013), no. 9, 582–590.
44. Fragkiskos Papadopoulos, Maksim Kitsak, Ángeles Serrano, Marián Boguñá, and Dmitri Krioukov, *Popularity versus similarity in growing networks*, Nature **489** (2012), no. 7417, 537–540.
45. Marlon Ramos, Jia Shao, Saulo Reis, Celia Anteneodo, José Andrade, Shlomo Havlin, and Hernán Makse, *How does public opinion become extreme?*, Scientific reports **5** (2015), 10032.
46. Christian Schmeltzer, Jordi Soriano, Igor Sokolov, and Sten Rüdiger, *Percolation of spatially constrained Erdős-Rényi networks with degree correlations*, Physical Review E **89** (2014), no. 1, 012116.
47. Friedhelm Schwenker, Friedrich Sommer, and Günther Palm, *Iterative retrieval of sparsely coded associative memory patterns*, Neural Networks **9** (1996), no. 3, 445–455.
48. Munik Shrestha and Cristopher Moore, *Message-passing approach for threshold models of behavior in networks*, Physical Review E **89** (2014), no. 2, 022805.
49. Tsvi Tlusty and Jean-Pierre Eckmann, *Remarks on bootstrap percolation in metric networks*, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical **42** (2009), no. 20, 205004.
50. Tatyana Turova, *The emergence of connectivity in neuronal networks: from bootstrap percolation to auto-associative memory*, Brain research **1434** (2012), 277–284.
51. Christopher Warren, Leonard Sander, and Igor Sokolov, *Geography in a scale-free network model*, Physical Review E **66** (2002), no. 5, 056105.
52. Duncan Watts, *A simple model of global cascades on random networks*, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **99** (2002), no. 9, 5766–5771.
53. Xin-Jian Xu, Xun Zhang, and José Mendes, *Impacts of preference and geography on epidemic spreading*, Physical Review E **76** (2007), no. 5, 056109.
54. Zhi-Dan Zhao, Ying Liu, and Ming Tang, *Epidemic variability in hierarchical geographical networks with human activity patterns*, Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science **22** (2012), no. 2, 023150.